REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 801 24 EA 000 877

THE ATTITUDES OF CERTIFICATED INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL TOWARD PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION AND "SANCTIONS."

BY- CARLTON, PATRICK W.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-8367 PUB DATE 67
GRANT OEG-4-7-008367-2007
EDRS PRICE MF-$1.00 HC-$9.16 227P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER ATTITUDES, *ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, *COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION, *SANCTIONS, *TEACHER STRIKES, MALES, FEMALES, TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, MEASUREMENT, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, EUGENE, NORTH CAROLINA,

BASED ON A 71 PERCENT RESPONSE FROM A SELECTED SAMPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS (345 MALE PRINCIPALS, 117 FEMALE PRINCIPALS, 399 MALE TEACHERS, AND 388 FEMALE TEACHERS), A STUDY WAS MADE OF EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THREE COMPONENTS OF COLLECTIVE ACTION--COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION, SANCTIONS, AND STRIKES. LIKERT-TYPE SCALES WERE DEVELOPED TO MEASURE ATTITUDINAL SETS OF THE FOUR GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO EACH OF THE THREE COMPONENTS. STATISTICAL ANALYSES, PRIMARILY BY TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AND PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION, CONFIRMED THE STUDY'S TWO MAJOR HYPOTHESES--(1) MALE EDUCATORS ARE MORE FAVORABLY INCLINED THAN FEMALE EDUCATORS TOWARD COLLECTIVE TEACHER ACTION, INCLUDING NEGOTIATIONS, SANCTIONS, AND STRIKES, AND (2) CLASSROOM TEACHERS ARE MORE FAVORABLY INCLINED THAN PRINCIPALS TOWARD TEACHER COLLECTIVE ACTION, INCLUDING COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS, SANCTIONS, AND STRIKES. RELATED FACTORS ANALYZED INCLUDED THE PERIOD OF EDUCATOR'S RESIDENCE IN THE STATE, EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, TYPE OF SCHOOL UNIT IN WHICH EMPLOYED, SIZE OF TOWN, LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE, LEVEL AT WHICH EMPLOYED, AND LEVEL OF CERTIFICATION. ANALYSIS INDICATED A SIGNIFICANTLY POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL ORIENTATION OF EDUCATORS ON A PROGRESSIVISM-TRADITIONALISM CONTINUUM BUT ONLY MINIMAL CORRELATIONS OF PHILOSOPHICAL ORIENTATION WITH SANCTIONS AND STRIKES. (JK)

BR-6-8367
P.A.24

The Attitudes of Certificated Instructional Personnel Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiations and "Sanctions"

EP 010 552

ED014801

Final Report to

Bureau of Research
Office of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Project number 6-8367
Grant number OEG-4-7-OO8367-2007

Patrick W. Carlton

EA 000 877

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE ATTITUDES OF CERTIFICATED INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL TOWARD PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION AND "SANCTIONS."

No. 6-8367
OEG-4-7-008367-2007

PATRICK W. CARLTON

1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Center For Advanced Study of Educational Administration

University of Oregon

Eugene, Oregon

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to a number of individuals and organizations for the help they rendered during the pursuit of this investigation. While it is not possible to name all of these persons, a few deserve special mention.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. John C. Otts, formerly Professor of Education at University of North Carolina and now Dean of the College of Education, University of South Carolina, for his counsel and support during the formative stages of the project.

Dr. Neal H. Tracy, Professor of Education at University of North Carolina, supplied considerable advice and constructive criticism during early stages of the study, which support is gratefully acknowledged.

Dr. Kinnard P. White, of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, rendered continual assistance throughout the study, critiquing, advising, and supplying information of a highly useful nature. His donation of time and energies went far beyond "the line of duty" and is especially appreciated.

Mr. J. E. Miller, Assistant Superintendent, and Mr. William W. Peek, Director of Statistical Services, both of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, threw their full support behind the research effort and were particularly helpful during the selection of the sample for the major study. Without their help the study would not have been possible.

Dr. Roland J. Pellegrin, Director of the Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, a U. S. Office of Education Research and Development Center, willingly placed the facilities of CASEA at the disposal of the researcher during the latter stages of the study, providing both moral and substantive support to the analytical effort, a fact which is gratefully acknowledged.

Dr. W. W. Charters, Jr., of CASEA, lent considerable assistance during the period of factor analysis, making available to the researcher his knowledge and experience in the area of scale construction. His reading and critique of early drafts of the manuscript were of great assistance, also.

Mr. Larry Janssen, of Oregon State University's Computer Laboratory, rendered yeoman's service by undertaking a rather massive computing assignment on short notice and by successfully supplying data in time to meet the research deadline.

Appreciation is expressed to the 900 North Carolina teachers and principals who contributed their time and effort to the project and who must, of necessity, be nameless.

Miss Janet Knitter, Mrs. Nancy Buckley, Mrs. Myrtle Feireisen and Mrs. Lois W. Carlton supplied secretarial support to the project, preparing drafts and final copy conscientiously and accurately. Their patience and perseverance was a source of strength to the researcher during the "trying" period of manuscript preparation.

The researcher's wife, Annie-Laurie M. Carlton, provided the staunch support so necessary for the researcher's mental comfort.

Finally, appreciation is expressed to the Research Branch of the U. S. Office of Education, Dr. Glenn C. Boerrigter, Research Coordinator, for provision of the financial support necessary to undertake the study.

All errors of omission and commission must, of course, remain the responsibility of the author and should not be attributed to any of the above named persons.

Patrick W. Carlton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY. 1

Purpose of the Study 4

Conceptual Framework 5

Analysis of Variance - Part I 7

Chi Square - Part II 8

Pearson Product Moment Correlations. . . . 9

Importance of the Study. 10

Studies in the Area of Collective Negotiations 11

Limitations of the Study 12

Organization of the Remainder of the Study . 13

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 15

Introduction 15

Sociological Basis of Teacher Militancy. . . 22

Machinery of Negotiations. 28

"Sanctions" 45

A Legal Analysis of Collective Action by Teachers. 54

Special Legislation Dealing with Public Employee Bargaining. 69

Conclusions 75

III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLLECTIVE ACTION SCALES. . 77

Likert Scale Construction. 78

CHAPTER PAGE

Pilot project. 80

Reliability Estimate 81

Sample Selection 82

Factor Analysis 85

IV. ANALYSIS OF COLLECTIVE ACTION DATA 93

Analysis of the Data 96

Collective Negotiations Scale-CA I 96

"Sanctions"-CA II 98

The Strike Scale-CA III 100

Hypotheses Generating Questions. 102

Correlations Between Collective Action Scales and Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale 111

V. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF ANALYSES OF THE COLLECTIVE ACTION SCALES 117

Correlations Between Dewey Progressivism and Collective Action 132

VI. RATIONALE FOR UTILIZATION OF KERLINGER'S EDUCATION SCALE I-AB 134

VII. ANALYSIS OF THE ES-I-AB DATA - THE PROGRESSIVISM-TRADITIONALISM SCALE 144

Hypotheses Utilized. 144

Analysis of the Data 147

VIII. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS OBTAINED THROUGH USE OF KERLINGER'S AB SCALE. 160

Discussion of the Findings 162

IX. THE VIEWS OF SOUTHERN TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS. . 174

PAGE

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 180

APPENDICES 195-216

A - Items Selected Through Literature Search. . . 195

B - Items Selected for Pilot Project 203

C - Probability Sampling Formula 206

D - R Matrix 207

F Matrix 208

Item Intercorrelations 209

E - Letters to Participants and Collective Action Instrument. 210

F - Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings and Item Total Correlations of all Items of Education Scale I. 216

Errata Sheet

Page 8, line 21 - After Principals insert (males and females).

Page 13, line 9 - applied to supplied.

Page 17, line 12 - delete "of" and insert it after primarily.

Page 19, footnote last line; change "," to "."

Page 27, line 24 -negotiation to negotiations.

Page 31, line 23 - delete comma after "agreement".

Page 46, line 1 - "of" should be "or"

Page 49, line 10 - insert "own" after their.

Page 51, line 5 - insert "to" after and.

Page 52, Footnote, line 2 - add: This position was changed at the 1967 National meeting of the NEA held in Minneapolis, Minnesota. It was resolved at that time that the NEA would support strikes instituted by its affiliates, under certain conditions.

Page 60 - ordinancy should be ordinance.

Page 65 - delete footnote 97.

Page 70, line 23 - "below" should be "above."

Page 82, line 9 - were adjudged satisfactory.

Page 114 - Footnote should read, in 2 places r's . . . . . are significant at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively. r for male principals should be .14 (CA-I).

Page 132, second from last line - expouse to espouse.

Page 144, In quote, line 7 - after questioned change , to ;

Page 145, line 14 - change Carolina College to East Carolina College.

Page 177, No. 20, line 4 - change 8 to 19.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Public Employee Bargaining Statutes. 71-74

II. Sample Data Statistics 84

III. V Matrix 86

IV. Intercorrelations of Items in Factors I, II, and III. 88

V. Factor Loadings of Items and Average Loading CA I, II, and III Scales 89-90

VI. Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Main hypotheses

Collective Negotiations - CA I 97

"Sanctions" - CA II. 99

Strikes - CA III. 101

VII. Subset Means and Standard Deviations for the CA I, CA II and CA III Scales. 103

VIII. Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Hypotheses

Generating Analyses. 105

Collective Negotiations - CA I Teachers only 105

Collective Negotiations - CA I Principals only. 106

IX. Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Hypotheses

Generating Analyses. 107

"Sanctions" - CA I Teachers only. 107

"Sanctions" - CA I . . . . 108 Principals only

TABLE PAGE

X. Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Hypotheses Generating Analysis. 109

Strikes - CA III Teachers only. 109

Strikes - CA III Principals only. 110

XI. Product-Moment Correlations between Collective Action Scales I, II and III and Education Scale I-AB 114

XII. Factor Array's for A and B Items. 138-139

XIII. x^2 and Percentage Analysis of A-B Scores - Total Groups Included. 148

XIV. x^2 Analysis of A-B Scores. 150-156

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

> "It is common knowledge that employment relations in American education have become a major source of conflict between the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and their state and local affiliates. The NEA advocates a set of procedures labeled "professional negotiation" and the AFT advocates collective bargaining."[1]

The demands of organized teacher groups for the right to participate in the determination of school policy have become a source of ever-increasing concern since 1961, the year in which the United Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, won representation rights for New York's 40,000 plus teachers, over the opposition of the National Education Association's local affiliate.

From that point on, the activities of the NEA were marked by an increasing militancy and activism in the area of teacher welfare. Casting about for a technique of bargaining which would "get the job done," yet avoid the stigma of "blue collar unionism," NEA developed the techniques of "professional negotiations" and "sanctions," which embody most of the essential techniques of private sector collective bargaining and strikes.

The significance of the development of two relatively powerful and militant interest groups in opposition to America's highly authoritarian educational bureaucracy is virtually unprecedented. It represents a potential realignment of the traditional power and influence structure in American schools.

---

[1] Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966), pp. 1-2.

Fischer recognized this in 1964, when he stated: "Virtually every innovation in the American schools during this decade will be influenced by...the insistence of teachers on the right to express their views on school policy questions."[2]

Although teacher militancy is general in nature, its primary impact to date has been upon urbanized areas of the country. This may be due to the fact that urban areas are receptive to the ideology of collective action, having dealt with organized labor for several decades. Another reason may be the larger number of teachers in urban systems and the increased bureaucratic impersonality of the working situation, both of which can contribute to a feeling of "disenfranchisement" on the part of teaching personnel. The fact that urban teachers, by and large, are more highly trained than rural personnel very likely promotes their instransigence on questions of salary and working conditions. Whatever the reasons, the fact is that big-city teachers and, to an extent, their suburban and rural neighbors, are ever-increasingly participating in forms of organized militancy.

Whether or not this conflict-ridden activity is salutary or not is moot at this time. Historically, educational administrators have expressed the notion that organizational peace and stability are normal, and that conflict is abnormal. They agree with Parsons, that conflict tends to be disruptive.[3] Their collective response to teacher militancy has been in terms of this school of thought. However, if one assumes conflict and change to be the normal state of affairs in organizational life, it becomes easier to take an optimistic tack and to look for the functions of conflict, rather than dwelling on its dysfunctions. As Simmel said:

---

[2] John H. Fischer, "Changes in American Education in the Next Decade," Innovation in Education, Mattew B. Miles, Editor (New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 622.

> "A certain amount of discord, inner divergence and outer controversy, is organically tied up with the very elements that ultimately hold the group together..."[4]

From this point of view, the very stability of structure manifested by the public school bureaucracy during the past 50 years is cause for some question concerning its creativity and adaptability. If, as Burns argues, "routine" is a substitute for normal change processes, it would appear that public education has been more than normally successful in suppressing a desirable form of activity.[5] Be this as it may, considerable conflict generation as a result of negotiation activities was in evidence in 1966.

---

[3] Talcott Parsons, "Social Classes and Class Conflict," American Economic Review XXXIX (1949), pp. 16-26.

[4] Georg Simmel, Conflict, Trans. by Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe, Ill: the Free Press, 1955), p. 17.

[5] Tom Burns, "The Forms of Conduct," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (September, 1958), pp. 137-151.

Purpose of the Study

Currently, little basic research into the thinking of public school personnel with regard to collective negotiations has been done.[6] It seemed desirable that measuring devices be developed for purposes of assessing thinking on this important topic, and the development of such scales was a major purpose of this study. The second major purpose was that of determining the attitudes of a sample of North Carolina teachers and principals toward collective negotiations, strikes, and "sanctions." In addition, the study explored the positions held by the sample with regard to progressive-traditional philosophical positions in education. This latter construct was measured through use of Kerlinger's Education Scale I-AB.

This study is divided into two major parts. Part I considers the development of three collective action attitude measuring devices, each of which measures a discrete facet of the collective action process; the CAI scale measures affect with regard to the process of collective negotiations; the CAII scale measures attitudes toward the "sanctions" process espoused by NEA; and the CAIII scale, deals with the strike in public education. These scales, were developed through the use of factor analysis and item analysis, two powerful predictive validity instruments. Part II reports the use of

---

[6] The term collective negotiations is here used to designate collective bargaining and professional negotiations jointly. For an explanation of the term, see Lieberman, *op. cit.* p. I.

Kerlinger's Education Scale I-AB with the North Carolina sample. The relationship between collective action stances and philosophical positions (progressivism-traditionalism) are also reported.

The design of the study is based upon the testing of a number of hypotheses based on sex and employment position classification among North Carolina educators. Four subsets have been identified for purposes of analysis: male teacher, female teacher, male principal, female principal. Significant differences in subset response have been identified by use of two-part analysis of variance, in the case of the collective action scales, and through use of X^2 in the case of Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale. Results are reported in terms of subset attitudes toward collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes in Part I, and toward Progressive-traditional educational philosophies in Part II. Pearson correlations are utilized to show the relationship between the CA scales and the ESI-AB Scale.

Conceptual Framework

Personnel operating in bureaucratic organizations tend to respond to disruption of traditional patterns of activity in terms of particular sets of constraints associated with their career expectations and personal orientations. In the case of male and female teachers, a difference in career and personal aspirations can be readily identified through direct questioning and through observation of employment patterns. In the case of men, the pattern in teaching is "up and out;" that is, men tend to move from teaching into administration, assuming their persistance in the field of education. The career pattern for female educators is more "in and out;" that is, women enter teaching for a few years, marry, and leave the field for family reasons. Later, when the children have reached a suitable age, they return to the classroom until retirement. This "spotty" employment pattern tends to lessen intensity of career commitment on the part of female educators. Thus, they are less likely to wish for involvement in militant activities designed to change occupational relationships than male teachers, who are "full time" educators.

A second influencing factor is economic in nature. While the career patterns of female teachers are such that, generally speaking, they are either single or "second-salaried," males typically bear family financial responsibilities throughout their careers. The anxieties accompanying generally inadequate instructional salaries are seen as promoting male support of militant activities designed to raise remuneration levels for teachers.

Role expectations significantly affect the preferences of educators, also. In the case of the principal, identification with administration plus the need to assure harmonious functioning of the school while maintaining a viable working relationship with the teaching staff, renders an enthusiastic response to militant teachers activities dubious. This is particularly so due to the fact that the principal is typically a target for such militancy.

Thus, at the conceptual level, the following hypotheses were included to be tested during the study. Male educators are more favorably inclined toward teacher militancy than female educators. Classroom teachers are more favorably inclined toward teacher militancy than principals.

Analysis of Variance (Part I)

At the operational level, the following hypotheses, expressed in terms of the three CA scales, were tested.

1) Male educators will score higher on items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," or strikes than female educators.[7]

2) Teachers will score higher on items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," or strikes than principals.

3) Interaction effects in scoring patterns based on sex and position will manifest themselves on items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes.

In addition to the testing of the above hypotheses, several other questions of interest have been considered in a hypothesis-generating attempt. Comparisons of responses are included, based on the following categories:

---

[7] A high score denotes an attitude favorable to the process in question.

years of residency in the state; education level; type of school unit in which employed; size of town of residence; years of experience; level at which employed; and certification level. Two other variables, marital status and region of residence, have been disregarded due to problems of incomplete data.

Chi Square (X^2) Part II

In Part II, consideration has been given to the attitudes of North Carolina educators toward questions of progressivism-traditionalism in educational matters. Extensive contact with North Carolina educators convinced the researcher that the population of this rural state is relatively homogeneous in educational philosophy. For this reason, the null hypothesis has been used in prediction of the outcome of tests made. At the conceptual level, it has been hypothesized that sex and position differences among educators do not occur in matters of progressivism-traditionalism. At the operational level, the following null hypotheses have been tested. There is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and principals to items dealing with progressivism-traditionalism in education.

In addition to the testing of these null hypotheses, other questions of interest have been included in an attempt at hypothesis generation. Comparisons of responses have been made based on the following categories: years of residency in the state; education level; type of school unit in which employed; size of town of residence; years of experience; level at which employed; and certification level.

Pearson Product Moment Correlations

Operating from the assumption that "liberal" social trends, such as teacher militancy, are conceptually related to the Dewey school of progressive educational thought and that those espousing one will likewise espouse the other, correlations were made between the CA I, II, and III scales and the ESI-AB scale. At the operational level the following hypotheses were tested.

A positive correlation exists between the responses of male teachers (female teachers, male principals, female principals) to items dealing with collective negotiations and those dealing with progressivism-traditionalism in educational matters.

A positive correlation exists between the responses of male teachers (female teachers, male principals, female principals) to items dealing with "sanctions" and those dealing with progressivism-traditionalism in educational matters.

A positive correlation exists between the responses of male teachers (female teachers, male principals, female principals) to items dealing with strikes and those dealing with progressivism-traditionalism in educational matters.

Importance of the Study

The importance of obtaining empirical data on the burgeoning teacher militancy movement is clear. To date there have been relatively few studies in the area, and none of the type herein reported. The availability of scales on collective action should be of considerable value to researchers in this field, supplying as it does a crude means of quantifying opinions on the subject of collective action. The study provides data relevant to the validity of CA Scales I, II, and III, and helps to establish something of their general reliability and usefulness to the field.

Additionally, the study provides information on the thinking of North Carolina educators in relation to the field of teacher militancy and progressivism-traditionalism in educational matters. Information on teacher thinking is much needed within the state. At the time the data was collected, no negotiation agreements had been signed within the state and no "sanctions" had been imposed. However, during 1966 the North Carolina Education Association held a meeting on "Professional Cooperation," (a polite euphemism for collective negotiations), the first of its kind in the state, and in April, 1967, the Winston-Salem, North Carolina chapter of the NCEA called for statewide "sanctions" against the local school unit, as a result of the failure of the school levy. The "sanctions" motion was referred to its death in a special committee of the state organization. However, this activity is symptomatic of the "powder keg" situation which now exists within the state. Information on teacher thinking can be utilized by North Carolina educators in planning for the future. States having somewhat similar organizational, fiscal and sociological patterns may hopefully profit from the availability of this date, also.

Studies in the Area of Collective Negotiations

Studies in the area of negotiations in public education have been relatively limited in number. The most exhaustive historical treatment to date was made by Lieberman and Moskow.[8] This massive work can probably best be described as a reference book on collective negotiations. Wildman and Perry have been pursuing a "Study of Collective Action by Public School Teachers" for several years. Their findings include primarily historical, statistical and legal data on the collective action movement.[9]

Corwin's recent studies in the area of staff conflicts as exemplified by militant activity draws heavily on sociological organization theory. He places emphasis upon the structural as opposed to personal correlates of organizational conflict and presents concepts meaningful for researchers in the field of collective action.[10] Having considerable relevance for collective negotiations in public education is Walton and McKersie's work on theory in labor negotiations. Their typology of bargaining is of particular value at this time.[11]

---

[8] Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow Collective Negotiations For Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966).

[9] Charles A. Perry and Wesley A. Wildman, "A Survey of Collective Acitivity Among Public School Teachers," Education Administration Quarterly, II (Spring, 1966), 133-151.

Goldhammer's recent report on problems in educational administration devotes some space to a survey of superintendents' thinking on collective negotiations which, while brief, is nevertheless instructive.[12] A number of doctoral dissertations have been written in this area, but are not focal enough to warrant citation in this report, it is felt.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to the total population of teachers and principals in North Carolina. Superintendents and supervisors are excluded from the study. The accuracy of the data is limited by the degree to which respondents answered frankly and truthfully. Since this topic is controversial, it may have been threatening to some respondents, a fact which could affect the veracity of responses. Generalization of the sampling data to the state population of educators is limited by the validity of the sample.

---

[10] Ronald G. Corwin, "Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools," (Cooperative Research Project No. 2637, Washington: U. S. Office of Education, 1966).

[11] Richard E. Walton & Robert B. McKersie, A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).

[12] Keith Goldhammer, et. al., Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration. Final Report, Project No. 6-2423 Washington, U. S. Office of Education, 1967).

The scales themselves are of the attitude-measurement type, whose limitations are well-known in educational circles. Their measurement potential is admittedly crude.

With regard to the statistical treatment, it should be noted that analysis of variance and Pearson correlation were employed in treatment of the CA I, II, and III Scales. While the intervality of the scales is dubious, considerable prior experience with them has shown that the results applied by interval measures correspond very closely with those supplied by ordinal measures. In fact, analysis by means of an ordinal measure has been made, to ascertain whatever differences might be apparent. As no appreciable differences were forthcoming the analysis of variance and Pearson correlation have been utilized. This argument is reinforced by that of Rosen and Rosen, who determined that Likert-type scale scores can be treated by both parametric and non-parametric techniques with comparable results from either analysis.[13]

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The study is divided into two parts, the first part dealing with the research using the CA I, II, and III Scales, and the second part dealing with the results of utilization of Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale.

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature in collective negotiations. Chapter 3 describes the development of CA Scales I, II and III through the pilot study stage.

---

[13] Hjalmar Rosen and R. A. Hudson Rosen, "A comparison of Parametric and Non-parametric Analysis of Opinion Data," The Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXIX (1955), pp. 401-404.

Chapter 4 describes the analysis of data collected in North Carolina through use of the CA I, II, and III Scales and explores the relationship of ESI-AB to CA I, II, and III. Chapter 5 gives conclusions drawn from the first part of the study.

Part II begins with Chapter 6, a rationale for the use of Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale. Chapter 7 discusses analysis of data collected using ESI-AB. Chapter 8 is devoted to a summary and conclusions on the ESI-AB data. Chapter 9, entitled "The Views of Southern Teachers and Principals," draws together the findings of the entire study and includes some closing observations by the researcher.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction.

> A resurgence of militancy among the nation's public school teachers marked the year 1963. There is mounting evidence that teachers are no longer content to rule only the classrooms to which they are assigned. They want a hand in the assignment and a voice in the policy that controls their professional lives. They are not asking to run the schools, but they want their views heard and heeded.[1]

The militancy referred to in the above quotation has been growing since 1963. Almost overnight, teacher-administrator-board relations have become one of the most controversial subjects on the educational scene.

In 1966, The National Education Association claimed that teachers were proposing a system of formal communication between staff and school board, utilizing educational channels. It was claimed that teachers, as trained professionals, knew more about what was academically desirable for American youth than did lay people serving on school boards. Educators, the NEA averred, were demanding that their views be heard and taken account of in matters affecting the schools. The NEA procedure for arriving at agreement on policy matters was somewhat euphemistically labelled Professional Negotiation (PN). T. M. Stinnett, formerly of NEA, defined PN as follows:

---

[1] New York Times, January 16, 1964, p. 88.

> In the simplest possible language, professional negotiation is a reaffirmation and formalization of the philosophy of staff relations which has been accepted in enlightened school districts for years. It is a cooperative approach - the partnership approach to policy development.[2]

This deceptively mild ideological statement referred to a procedure that has resulted in an educational power struggle of sizeable proportions. Sociologists like Corwin disputed the idea of cooperative determination of policy, preferring to talk in terms of power transfer from administrator to teacher.[3] The latter approach bore considerable relationship to fact.

The social context. Americans of 1967 live in a nation of growing population, higher costs, and standards of living unprecedented in U.S. history. With rising school enrollments have come increasing numbers of teachers, (totaling 1,699,330 as of 1965-66), many of whom are men.[4] Male teachers, generally more motivated by economic concerns than female teachers, tend to be more activist in their educational outlook. Pressure seems to be rising for revision of allegedly outmoded employer-employee relationships.

---

[2] T. M. Stinnett, "Professional Negotiation, Collective Bargaining, Sanctions and Strikes," NASSP Bulletin, XLVIII (April, 1964), pp. 93-104.

[3] Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education. (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965).

[4] Research Division, National Education Association Research Bulletin, 44 (February, 1966), p. 22.

Teacher groups have become more active and better organized in the past decade. The National Education Association has come to act in a more forceful manner than previously has been the case. Some state organizations have likewise begun to manifest militant tendencies over matters concerning teacher welfare.

One of the effective stimulations to action on the part of the state and national professional associations has been the organizational activity of the American Federation of Teachers, an organization composed of primarily more activist members of the teaching profession.[5] This union, which is affiliated with AFL-CIO, has advocated militant action for some time and recently won a number of representation elections, primarily in heavily industrialized areas having a union orientation. The AFT, which has a current membership about one-eighth the size of NEA's (125,000 as opposed to NEA'S 1,000,000 in 1967) has served as an effective goad to NEA action. In reference to the New York representation election which was won by AFT (1961), Wesley A. Wildman had this to say:

> Frightened or at least stimulated beyond all cause by New York, NEA has begun, haltingly at first, now with rapidly growing sophistication, to build a philosophical and practical organizing program leading to negotiations, shared control,

---

[5] American Federation of Teachers, Organizing the Teaching Profession (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).

and power wielding on the local level, which presents a very appealing alternative to the AFT program.[6]

Early NEA militance. The first case of NEA's applying "sanctions," meaning public denunciation of an inferior school district, individual member, or state, took place in North College Hill, Ohio, where the board of education fired its superintendent under questionable circumstances. At the request of local and state association members, NEA issued a "sanctions" statement indicating "that we call on all worthy members of the teaching profession to refuse to accept a position in the school system as long as it remains under the domination of the present board of education." This action was taken on the morning of June 17, 1947. The entire board resigned by that evening.[7] This type of sanction, or "black-listing," as R. B. Kennan of the NEA called it at the time, has been used in subsequent situations with varying degrees of success.

Individual "sanctions" were first applied in 1946, when NEA expelled Chicago Superintendent William H. Johnson on charges of unethical conduct.

---

[6] W. A. Wildman, "Collective Action by Public School Teachers: An Emerging Issue," Administrators Notebook (February, 1963).

[7] Stanley Elam. "Collective Bargaining and Strikes - or Professional Negotiations and Sanctions," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIV (October, 1962), pp. 1-11.

In 1951, NEA and the Montana Education Association announced that a system in that state was "not a desirable place for competent members of the teaching profession to seek positions."[8]

In April, 1962, the California Teachers Association applied sanctions against the Little Lake School District, primarily because of bad board-superintendent-staff relationships. After nearly two years, a satisfactory adjustment of the problem was achieved and sanctions were lifted in March, 1964.[9] Still more recently, the Utah Education Association and the NEA invoked sanctions against the entire state of Utah. This unprecedented move made educational history. The "sanctions" lasted 300 days, and were lifted only after major improvements had been promised. In fact, the 1965 legislature voted an increase in state support of $24.6 million for the 1965-67 biennium.[10] In 1965, the Oklahoma Education Association and the NEA invoked "sanctions" against the state of Oklahoma. The "sanctions" resulted in the appropriation of $28 million for the biennium by the Oklahoma legislature.[11]

---

[8] Department of Classroom Teachers, Classroom Teachers Speak on Professional Negotiations (Washington: National Education Association, 1963), p. 10.

[9] Louise Paine, "Sanctions in Little Lake," National Education Association Journal, LI (December, 1962), pp. 54-55.

[10] John C. Evans, Jr., Utah School Crisis-1963 (Salt Lake City: Desert News Press, 1963). Also, Elaine Exton, "Pros and Cons of Sanctions Invoked by Utah's Public School Teachers," The American School Board Journal, CXLVII (July, 1963),

Professional Negotiation and "Sanctions." The formal adoption of a resolution concerning Professional Negotiation, which is NEA's label for collective negotiation, took place at the NEA convention, held in Denver, Colorado, in 1962.[12] It was subsequently reaffirmed at the Detroit, Michigan convention in 1963 and in 1964, at the Seattle convention, with minor changes.

The 1964 Resolution states:

> The National Education Association insists on the right of professional associations, through democratically selected representatives using professional channels, to participate with boards of education in the formulation of policies of common concern, including salary and other conditions of professional service.

The 1965 and 1966 Resolutions maintain the same general point of view, perhaps even more strongly stated.[13]

---

[11] Shawn Kalkstein, "Oklahoma's Education War," Look, XXX (January 25, 1966), pp. 80-86. Also, Barbara Carter, "The Teachers Give Oklahoma A Lesson," The Reporter (September 9, 1965), pp. 34-36.

[12] A similar resolution had been considered by the delegate assembly of National Education Association in 1961. It did not, however, refer to Professional Negotiation by name.

[13] National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings of the 103rd Annual Meeting, CIII (Washington: The Association, 1965). Also, National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings of the 104th Annual Meeting, CIV (Washington: The Association, 1966).

Professional "sanctions" were proposed by Arthur F. Corey, Executive Secretary of the California Teachers Association, at the 1963 convention. He called for the identification and publicization of school districts not maintaining satisfactory conditions for professional members of the association, and further called for the notification of placement offices throughout the country and a request that they no longer refer applicants for teaching positions to offending districts. Corey felt that the whole weight of local, state, and national associations should be brought to bear on inferior districts.

The "sanctions" proposals, following formal presentation to the 1963 convention by the Oregon delegation, received great support from the Department of Classroom Teachers, but were met with initial disapproval from the American Association of School Administrators, National School Boards Association, and some lay groups.[14]

This was to be expected, since the application of "sanctions" against a school district had implications for redistribution of power and decisional authority in educational matters. The statements of AASA and NSBA have consistently opposed the use of "sanctions and other forms of coercion, in accordance with their organizational philosophies. This behavior precisely patterns that of typical special interest groups operating in a political context.

---

[14] "Administrators Give Reluctant Approval to Sanctions - Condemn Strikes Three to One," The Nation's Schools, LXX (November, 1962), p. 71. Also, Elaine Exton, "NSBA Opposes Teachers Strikes and Sanctions," The American School Board Journal, CXLVI (June, 1963), pp. 41-44.

SOCIOLOGICAL BASIS OF TEACHER MILITANCY

Corwin claims that the movement toward collective action is the result of teacher desire for professionalization of their calling.[15] He refers to professionalization in the following manner: "...whatever else it is, professionalization represents the drive of a group to control its own work; and conversely it represents dissatisfaction with the traditional forms of control.[16]

From this definition, then, it appears logically that teachers are attempting to take from administration and board some of the power and control which these groups have historically held. Since human beings normally do not relinquish power without a struggle, it is reasonable to assume that some degree of tension and overt strife are concomitant to this drive for control.

Lieberman says "...power is not usually given to a group. It is taken by it. More precisely, the public does not actively give power to a group; rather, it acquiesces to a taking of power by the group.[17]

---

[15] Collective action is the generic term for all forms of teacher activism, including Professional Negotiation, collective bargaining, strike, and "sanctions."

[16] Ronald G. Corwin. A Sociology of Education (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965), p. 262.

When Corwin refers to "the drive of a group to control its work," he refers very directly to power. For power is, to quote Clayton: "...organized and sustained social influence or control exerted by persons or groups on the decisions and actions of others. It relates to effectiveness in influencing action, decision and policy in the entire range of human association.[18]

Lieberman states that power is an area too long neglected in education. He contends as follows:

> Some people regard teachers as a powerful group. A wide variety of evidence has led me to an opposite conclusion... I have never met an influential political leader who regarded teachers organizations as a particularly important or influential lobby.[19]

And again:

> The concept of power is one of the most important and most neglected aspects of teacher education. In education, neglect of the power structure has led to a misleading emphasis upon the formal aspects of professionalism and democracy while their substance is often lacking. For the most part, professors have trained the public school teachers in organizational impotence and naivete.[20]

---

[17] Myron Lieberman, "Power and Policy in Education," Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, XL (September, 1964), pp. 21-29.

[18] A. S. Clayton, "Professionalization and Problems of Power," Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (March, 1965), pp. 69-73.

[19] Lieberman, op. cit., p. 22.

[20] Lieberman, Education as a Profession (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1956), p. 484.

Clayton states that improvement in this area must be made.

> ...our interest is in the more distinctively philosophical concerns underlying this mixture of platitudinous virtue and avoidance of collective responsibility. We need to sense and come to grips with questions that focus directly on the normative (moral-ethical) dimensions of problems of power, among them questions about the values that power is to serve.[21]

Clayton defines the moral-ethical dimensions of power as follows:

> In the conception of power appropriate to professionalization, power is grounded not in patterns of dominance and submission but in the enlargement and diversity of participation in human association.
>
> ...this power...should be used within a framework of studied policy, and these directives for action should be broadly shared within the profession.[22]

The problems involved in a gain of power for teachers are many. To begin with, Lieberman indicates that there is public opposition to strong teachers organizations. The fact that education has traditionally been considered nonpartisan has tended to reinforce the belief that teachers should exercise little influence in community activities. Also, there has been much teacher apathy and lack of willingness to take power for the group. On this point, Lieberman states that:

---

[21] Clayton, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

> The teachers must realize that their non-classroom duties are just as important as their classroom duties. They must begin to devote their time and energies to such matters as certification, accreditation, and professional ethics instead of leaving these things in the hands of administrative personnel.[23]

In addition to public opposition and teacher apathy, there is a tradition in America that no one admits a desire for the possession of power. This is part of our democratic-pragmatic heritage, in which Americans on the one hand extol the virtues of equality and democratic participation, and on the other hand admire those persons who can "get the job done," by whatever means necessary. Lynd states it this way: "We Americans have an uneasy awareness that power as we know it and use it, and democracy as we profess it, do not fit well together.[24]

John Kenneth Galbraith has also made interesting comments on the problem of "power concealment." He says:

> Power obviously presents awkward problems for a community which abhors its existence, disavows its possession, but values its exercise.
>
> The privilege of controlling the actions or of affecting the income and property of other persons is something that no one of us can profess to seek or admit possessing.

---

[23] Lieberman, _op_. _cit_., p. 508.

[24] Robert S. Lynd, "Power in American Society as Resource and Problem," in Arthur Kornhauser (ed.), _Problems of Power in American Democracy_ (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1957), p. 7.

> Despite this convention (of reticence and understatement) which outlaws ostensible pursuit of power and which leads to a constant search for euphemisms to disguise its possession, there is no indication that, as a people, we are averse to power. On the contrary, few things are more valued and more jealously guarded by their possessors in our society.[25]

Even though there is general recognition in American society of the desirability of power, teachers have somehow failed to take and hold what might be considered a necessary share--necessary in the sense of providing for a reasonably secure and profitable professional existence. Fairly recently, however, a movement in the direction of professionalization (i.e., gain of power) has begun to occur within teaching ranks.

Corwin points out that there are two contrasting images of teachers in our society, one of bureaucratic control exerted over docile employees, and the other a professional self-conception of competence and ability to control the working situation. These dual images, Corwin avers, tend to divide teachers and administrators. He says that "...professionalization challenges the traditional ideologies of local control by laymen and by their hired professional administrators."[26]

---

[25] John K. Galbraith, American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power, Revised ed. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1956), pp. 26-27.

[26] Ronald G. Corwin, The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, Cooperative Research Project, No. 1934 (Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1963), p. 42.

Since the granting of even a modicum of decision-making power to teachers erodes the decision-making power of both principal and superintendent, a question of vested interest and its protection tends to arise. Corwin states that:

> ...the actual authority of teachers to make decisions is often limited informally if not officially. The limitation of the decision-making authority of subordinate professionals may occur even in situations where there is a strong ideology in support of the right of professionals to influence the decision process.[27]

He also states that:

> ...the basic issue behind the question of the teacher's place in the decision-making process is how much final authority is to be granted to teachers to make the important decisions.[28]

From the above statements it is evident that professionalization is a militant process, the end of which is attainment of an ever greater share of power at the expense of controlling authorities. This search for power is being implemented by teachers through use of collective negotiation, which is the generic term for collective bargaining and Professional Negotiation. It is on the latter that attention will be focused throughout this treatment.

---

[27] Corwin, A Sociology of Education, pp. 275-276.

[28] Ibid.

MACHINERY FOR NEGOTIATIONS

> Professional negotiation is a set of procedures to provide an orderly method for teachers associations and school boards, through professional channels to negotiate on matters of common concern, to reach mutually satisfactory agreements on these matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of impasse.[29]

NEA claims that professional negotiation agreements differ only slightly from what has been occurring in enlightened school districts for many years. The first major difference, it is alleged, is in the adoption of formal, written procedures for conducting negotiations, which procedures form a basic framework within which to operate. The second difference is concerned with the formulation of a procedure for dealing with disagreement or impasse. It is unlikely that any two school districts would adopt exactly the same kind of negotiation agreement. This is perhaps to be expected since school districts have developed problems of such a highly individual nature that set patterns of negotiation are not necessarily applicable.

Many educators aver that the aspects of school operation that can be dealt with by negotiation are practically unlimited. Most matters of joint concern to a professional organization and a local school board could be included, such as: salary, fringe benefits, general personnel policies, class size, lunch periods, rest periods, class load, standards for employment of teaching and administrative personnel, communication within the school system, instructional materials, etc. Lieberman, on the other hand, feels that there are decided limits to these areas appropriate for negotiation.[30]

---

[29] Office of Professional Development and Welfare, Guidelines for Professional Negotiation (Washington: National Education Association, 1963), p. 7.

Three types of teacher-board agreements. In the past there have been, generally speaking, three basic types of teacher participation with the board. The first of these was characterized by a presentation of proposals to the board by teacher representatives. There was no discussion other than possibly a few polite questions. The teacher representatives departed and the board made its unilateral decision.

The second type of participation involved the presentation of proposals to the board, along with supporting data. The members of the board discussed the proposals with the representatives and among themselves. They gave assurances of taking the proposals into consideration when making decisions. The board then proceeded to make its decision.

---

[30] Myron Lieberman, from a speech made before Phi Delta Kappa, February 14, 1966, in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

In the third type of procedure, the board heard proposals of the teacher representatives, discussed them with the representatives, made its own proposals to them, heard counter-proposals and gradually worked out the differences that arose. Tannenbaum and Schmidt, speaking of employer-employee relationships, classify procedures similar to the above on a continuum leading from extreme boss-centered leadership, on the one hand (as represented by the first procedure), to what is called subordinate-centered leadership (as characterized by the third procedure.)[31]

Professional negotiation, it is claimed, takes the third approach to negotiations. This approach affirms the philosophy held by many educators that the cooperative approach to policy development is conducive to progress and effectiveness in school operations. There are, of course, those who feel this is not true.

It has been argued by some boards and administrators that negotiation calls for an abrogation of authority vested in the boards of education by the state, and that this represents an unconstitutional exercise of discretion. However, NEA hastens to point out that the right to participate in policy formulation does not necessarily imply the right to make decisions on policy matters. Put another way, professional negotiation does not involve cooperative policy adoption or cooperative policy administration. These functions are, it is claimed, reserved to board and superintendent. James E. Allen, New York State Commissioner of Education, had this to say:

---

[31] Robert Tannenbaum and Warren H. Schmidt, "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," Harvard Business Review, XXXVI, 2 (March-April, 1958), p. 96.

> The enactment of policy is the single act and responsibility of the board, but the formulation of policy should be a cooperative process utilizing the intellectual resources of the whole school staff. This participation in the development of policy should not be thought of as a favor granted by the board of education or the administration, but rather as a right and an obligation.[32]

Such agreements, while legalistically sound, seem to beg the basic issue, which deals with the question of control of decision-making in educational matters.

Levels of recognition. Three levels of recognition are generally accepted by NEA as being appropriate in Professional Negotiation, although less emphasis is being placed upon the levels as negotiation becomes more universally accepted as an appropriate tactic. The "level one" negotiation agreement, is merely a declaration by the school board that it recognizes education as a profession and the right of teachers to join or not join professional organizations, and that it agrees to hear and consider proposals from representatives of organized employee groups. This level agreement, under which all groups may present proposals and expect a hearing, is roughly comparable to "informal" recognition of labor unions as practiced by the U.S. Government.

---

[32] James E. Allen, in an address to Regents Institute for New School Board Members, New York, August, 1964.

A "level two" agreement, claimed to be more desirable than the preceding one, includes the provisions of "level one" plus a written document detailing procedures for recognizing and negotiating with the teachers association having a majority of the local membership. This type of agreement is similar to the "formal" recognition accorded by the U.S. Government to unions. In this agreement, the role of the superintendent is delineated, but there is no provision for dealing with persistent disagreement or impasse.

The most desirable form of agreement from NEA's point of view, the "level three" agreement, gives relatively complete details of the negotiating process, including an appeal procedure to be used in time of persistent disagreement or impasse. The NEA points out that a grievance procedure is not synonymous with a negotiation procedure, as some have intimated. Grievance procedures can be negotiated, added to a negotiation procedure, or left out of it. The grievance procedure is an entity unto itself.[33]

---

[33] Office of Professional Development and Welfare, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

In some situations, impasse procedures are not included in the original agreement on professional negotiation, but are added at a later time.

Impasse procedures. In case of impasse, a specialized set of procedures is used. NEA's Guidelines for Professional Negotiation defines impasse as: Persistent disagreement between the parties requiring the use of mediation or an appeals procedure for resolution." It seems to be of extreme importance to NEA that all mediation and arbitration actions be handled through "educational channels," meaning boards or panels especially established for the purpose of hearing such appeals. NEA's reason for this is that the special board removes educational matters from the hands of labor mediation groups, with their precedents and statutes dealing with mediation. NEA intimates that the procedures appropriate to labor in private industry are not appropriate to educational problems.

There is probably the rather hardheaded realization on NEA's part that identification with labor would serve to strengthen the position of the American Federation of Teachers, an AFL-CIO affiliate.

Speaking of the establishment of an appeals panel, Martha Ware had this to say:

> At the first stage of appeal or mediation after impasse, by far the procedure used most often is the classic three-man panel. That is, one member selected by the local association, one by the school board, and a third by these two.

> If you are interested in names, here are some used to identify the panels: Agreement Assistance Panel...Board of Review...Mediation Board...Advisory Board...and Review Committee.[34]

A second level of appeals could be established at the state level. Appeals could go to the state superintendent or to the state education association; the state board of education; a specially appointed panel; or directly to the public at large. Steffenson has difficulty in reconciling the use of the third party approach to educational matters, since the board of education has historically been cast in the roles of both employer and representative of the public interest. He feels that transfer of the board's responsibility to a neutral third party implies that this party would assume the "public representative" role.[35] This eventuality could be avoided through the implementation of the suggestion that school boards, for purposes of impasse procedures, will be considered to be acting in their "employer" role.

Compulsory arbitration. It is felt by NEA and the U.S. Civil Service Commission, along with many others, that mandatory arbitration of salary questions is not desirable in educational matters, as a general rule. The question continues to arise, however, and two states have laws requiring some classes of public employee to submit their disputes to arbitration. (Rhode Island and Maine). It is conceivable that such statutes might be applied to teachers as well, at some time in the future.

---

[34] Martha Ware, "Procedures for Dealing with Impasse," Professional Negotiation Conference Report (Washington: National Education Association, 1964), p. 24.

[35] James P. Steffensen, "Appeal from an Impasse," Monthly Labor Review, LXXVII (November, 1964), pp. 1295-1296.

It is interesting to note that President Kennedy's Executive Order 10988, Employment-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service - promulgated in 1962 - extends the right of union representation to government employees, but with a strong no-strike clause included in the agreement. Since this order, there has been an increase in the efforts of employee groups to develop strong organizations and to bargain collectively with their employers at the Federal level. It would be unwise to discount the influence of this activity on the development of Professional Negotiation and collective negotiations in general.

Roles of Various Educational Groups in PN and "Sanctions."

A. National association. Until 1962, NEA's role was primarily one of public relations and provision of information. Its representatives consulted with the local and state associations in matters concerning teaching and legislation favorable to teachers, and encouraged local school districts in their efforts to secure representation rights. The organization has undergone considerable philosophical reorientation, however. In 1964 and 1965, NEA acted forcefully in the Utah and Oklahoma situations, throwing its national reputation behind efforts to reach a settlement of the difficulties present in the two states. This seems to indicate a more dynamic educational position on the part of the national organization.

B. State and local associations. Regional differences make it difficult to set forth one firm pattern of organization or activity for state and local associations, although some activities are common to all associations. NEA feels that state associations should seek to improve interrelationships between teaching, administrative, and lay members of the academic community. The state associations should support the efforts of local associations to achieve professional negotiation agreements, support appropriate legislation, provide training for local association personnel in the principles and techniques of negotiation, and cooperate with other state and national associations in improving the educational climate in the United States.[36]

Most state associations have not fulfilled these obligations to the maximum extent, as for example the Oklahoma Education Association, which apparently came close to losing its leadership position during the "sanctions" of 1965. Observers such as Richard Morgan, formerly of the NEA, feel that this was because the leadership of the organization had not pressed aggressively enough for educational reform - that is, had not really led the teachers in welfare matters.[37]

---

[36] Office of Professional Development and Welfare, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

It may be well at this point to emphasize the importance of effective educational legislation at the state level for the future of professional negotiation. Often, the activities of state association lobbyists can help determine the educational course of an entire state for extended periods. It is, therefore, advisable to exert pressures for the enactment of state laws requiring provision for negotiation at the local level. Donald H. Wollett, formerly a legal consultant with NEA, had this to say: "State legislation will accelerate the process of establishing professional negotiation, substituting for voluntarism the mandate of law."[38] Among students of negotiation the term "voluntarism" has a bad connotation. To them voluntarism encourages delay and avoidance of a socially desirable course of action by the conservative forces of society. In this context "conservative forces" refers to taxpayers' groups and others involved financially in the education process, and who stand to lose from most alterations in traditional patterns of educational finance. Also, to be classed as "conservative forces" are members of administration, who fear a loss of status and power as a result of the development of negotiatory instruments. Professional negotiation poses a threat to local autonomy and lay control; it threatens traditional line and staff management ideas; and it could be "too effective" in raising taxes for local tastes. Change is, therefore, often resisted. In industrial areas school boards tend to fear the possibility of offending the AFL-CIO, which sponsors the AFT, and consequently drag their collective feet in implementing NEA type negotiations. Thus, laws establishing the right of some form of negotiation are necessary.

---

[37] Richard Morgan, from an interview at NEA Headquarters, January 12, 1966.

[38] Donald H. Wollett, "The Importance of State Legislation," Professional Negotiation Conference Report (Washington: NEA, 1964), p. 92.

Students of negotiation tend to favor a legal mandate which establishes the legitimacy of the teachers association. In this way the association can become a legal entity, having certain rights and responsibilities and can wield a certain amount of influence and power.

The "influence and power" wielded by the association is seen as tending to balance lay conservative pressures for economy. Wollett, formerly of NEA, stated:

> When we talk about Professional Negotiations, we are talking about two things fundamentally. We envision what one might call a countervailing force of organized teachers which asserts professional pressures equal to lay pressures.... By this process, the organized profession becomes a full partner with the board of education in forming and shaping local school policy.
>
> The second thing I see is that professional negotiation is a vehicle whereby teachers acquire greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their functions.[39]

---

[39] Wollett, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

C. Role of the superintendent. The NEA officially sees the role of the superintendent of schools as a dual one, although privately some personnel feel differently. It is claimed that he is the executive officer of the board, responsible for local policy administration; it is also claimed that he is a member and leader of the professional staff, with the responsibility for supporting the efforts of local professional associations in their attempts to achieve negotiation. He is seen as supplying information to both the local association and to the board, acting in a mediatory role during the process of professional negotiation, and as having a similarity of interest with the teachers.

Many students of negotiation feel that this view is not correct, that there is not necessarily a continuity of interest between superintendent and teacher in the strict sense of the word. The superintendent may, it is felt, have the same general professional goals, (i.e. bettering the education process), as the teachers have, but his interests and responsibilities are not coincident with those of the teaching staff. Wollett put it this way:

> The superintendent has a range of responsibilities, pressures, problems and insecurities as an employee which are not shared by his teachers as employees and, I may say, vice-versa. His identification with the profession is diluted by the need to keep peace with the school board and the community.
>
> The superintendent is caught in this conflict and his job as chief executive officer may, in a given case, compel him, realistically, to respond to the lay pressure rather than to the professional pressure.

> The superintendent is the chief executive officer of the district and...the teachers, in hierarchical terms, are lower-level employees.[40]

Some educators feel that the superintendent may more and more be recognized as a sort of "educational city manager," acting purely as an administrative officer for the board, with no pretense of acting for the teachers, who will be represented by the professional association.

La Piere, speaking of the superior-subordinate relationship in organizations stated: "An administrator may... favor his superiors or his subordinates; usually it is the former."[41]

Godine says that:

> The fact that significant job elements are common to the employment situation of all civil servants should not obscure the equally important consideration that officials vested with the responsibility for the management of the bureaucracy must be clearly distinguished from employees under their supervision. The proper discharge of their responsibility requires that these officials represent their ultimate employers without the interposition of a divided loyalty to a private association whose very raison d'etre is to press demands the evaluation and satisfaction of which often depend upon the judgment of supervisory personnel[42]

---

[40] Donald H. Wollett, "The Strategy of Negotiation," Professional Negotiation Conference Report (Washington: NEA, 1964), pp. 80-81.

[41] R. T. La Piere, A Theory of Social Control (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954), pp. 401-402

[42] M. R. Godine, The Labor Problem in the Public Service (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), pp. 101-102.

Lieberman indicates that a readily identifiable conflict of interest exists between the superintendent and teaching personnel. He points out that this same problem exists in other professional situations, but that they have met the problem by establishing separate organizations for leaders and led. He indicates that "...teaching is the largest group of employees...in which the distinction between the managerial...personnel...and the personnel... managed...is not recognized in the employee organizations."[43]

He further points out that:

> The fact that many administrators do try to raise teachers' salaries and support other teacher activities is no reason to regard them as 'representatives' of the teachers. Only persons designated by the teachers themselves should be regarded as their representatives.[44]

It is likely that administrators will retain their membership in some teacher organizations, while relinquishing it in others as recently occurred in Michigan, where the administrator and teacher organizations split. They will probably tend to lose their status as leaders within teacher organizations, being replaced by teacher-elected or chosen representatives from their own ranks.

---

[43] Myron Lieberman, Education As A Profession (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1956), p. 286.

[44] Myron Lieberman, "Who Speaks for Teachers?" Saturday Review XLVIII (June 19, 1965), pp. 64-66.

D. Role of the principal. The principal, as the administrative officer serving directly with the teaching force, is in a somewhat less easily defined position than the superintendent and other central office personnel, with regard to negotiation. The principal is sometimes caught in an intellectual, emotional and economic dilemma. Since he works constantly with teachers, his sympathies and interests may tend to lie with them. He "identifies" with the teaching staff. Yet, he is hired by the superintendent, and, is an officer of the administration. As a result, a principal may be obliged, for economic reasons, to implement directives which he finds personally distasteful, because of his identification with the teaching group. This is the "foreman problem," so well known in the field of public administration.[45]

The problem is so named because the foreman, like the principal, works directly with the productive group of the organization, and depends for his success upon this group. Yet, also like the principal, the foreman is ultimately accountable to administration, and must implement the directives of administration.

The principal, with his special problem of role identification, has encountered role conflict in the negotiation process. NEA has consistently claimed that a single professional group can represent the interests of all educators. AFT has claimed that it is better that principals and other administrators be excluded from the teachers organization. Neither organization has been able to completely enforce local and state compliance with the national policy. Thus, there are NEA affiliates which exclude principals and AFT affiliates which admit principals. It should be noted that the AFT voted, in 1967, to accept no more principals. Those currently holding memberships will not be disenfranchised, however.

---

[45] Fritz J. Roethlisberger, "The Foreman: Man in the Middle," in Robert Dubin (ed.), Human Relations in Administration (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951), pp. 141-148.

Until quite recently, the principal has said little regarding his role in collective negotiation. Epstein has presented perhaps the most crystallized position available. He points out that in any teachers organization, principals suffer two major disadvantages. He states:

> Since administrators...have a lesser voting power than classroom teachers, is it not possible that their welfare and concerns could be voted down or compromised within cases where such decisions are expedient for teachers? The second problem is one of principle and involves the question of whether...employees on lower levels of responsibility should have the right or privilege of playing a crucial part in determining such items as salaries and conditions of employment of those who are at the higher levels.[46]

---

[46] Benjamin Epstein, "What Status and Voice for Principals and Administrators in Collective Bargaining and 'Professional Negotiation' by Teacher Organizations," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIX (March, 1965), p. 249.

This pair of valid arguments must be weighed against the possibility of continued control or "leadership" by principals holding membership in teachers' organizations. Epstein apparently feels that the disadvantages of retained membership outweigh the advantages, in the case of the principal. He says:

> In this context, perhaps principals and administrators may find it a more effective procedure to provide for their own welfare in their respective school districts if they speak on their own behalf rather than relying for representation on organizations which concentrate primarily on solving the problems of primary concern to teachers.[47]

He continues:

> While one would like to hope that the superintendent, even during the most difficult periods of negotiations with teachers' bargaining agents, would remain the staunch protagonist supporting the position of principals ...this is not always the case. The superintendent could well be a non-participant in negotiations...[48]

Having cast doubts on the desirability of continued administrative participation in teacher organizations, Epstein recommends that administrators form strong bargaining units of their own and seek to influence educational programs as independent pressure groups. The role of the principal in collective negotiation has not become clearly enough defined at this time for more than tentative conclusions to be drawn. While NEA and AFT continue to argue about the principal's proper role, he may, as Epstein suggests, take the matter into his own hands by establishing an independent bargaining position, from which he can exercise some degree of control in educational matters.

---

[47] Epstein, op. cit., p. 250.

[48] Ibid.

"SANCTIONS"

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary lists the following definition for sanction:

> A restrictive measure used to punish a specific action or to prevent some future activity.
>
> ...coercion, restitution, or undoing of what was wrongly accomplished...[49]

From the above definition it can be seen that sanction can refer to a broad range of coercive activities, from oral remonstrance to physical punishment, or even death. In its more usual forms sanctions may take the form of withheld services, lockout, blacklisting, slowdown in production, unfavorable publicity, etc.

Early militance. An early example of teacher sanction is reported by Ciminillo, who indicates that in 1802, Thomas Peugh, teacher in a small settlement north of Cincinatti, Ohio, "refused to unlock the school and hold class until such time as the school committee formally committed to paper a stipulation giving him at least one afternoon per month off so that he might move to new lodgings."[50]

---

[49] Webster's Third New International Dictionary (Springfield: G. and C. Merriam Co., 1961), p. 2009.

This simple activity conducted by a single teacher has been repeated numerous times during the past one hundred and sixty-four years. However, it was not until 1916, with the founding of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), that a union dedicated primarily to the welfare of teachers was established. The AFT has, for some time, favored the use of withheld services (strike) as an appropriate sanction in time of controversy. Between 1940 and 1964, one hundred thirteen teacher strikes took place, some of which were sponsored by the AFT. It should be pointed out that 25% of these strikes by teachers were conducted by members of teachers associations, however, and not by union members.[51] A considerable number of additional strikes have occurred since that time.

The NEA, as an organization, took relatively little overt militant action in behalf of teachers' welfare until well after the turn of the century. In 1929, the NEA Code of Ethics stated that "teachers must refuse to accept a position that has been created through unprofessional activity, or pending controversy over professional policy of the application of unjust personnel practices or procedures."[52]

---

[50] Lewis M. Ciminillo, no title. Paper written at the University of Indiana, Bloomington, 1965, p. 1. (Photocopy)

[51] Lawrence R. Klein, "The NEA Convention and Organizing the Teachers," Monthly Labor Review, LXXXVII (August, 1964), p. 884.

In June, 1947, "sanctions" were first imposed by NEA against a school board in North College Hill, Ohio.[53] The sanction took the form of denunciation of the unjust activities reportedly being carried on by the board. Apparently, the sanction had a coercive effect, since the entire school board resigned that day. Other early "sanctions" took place in Kelso, Washington, in 1950, and Polson, Montana, in 1951.

It was during the North College Hill crisis that the Executive Committee of NEA made the following significant statement:

> Group action is essential today. The former practice where teachers individually bargained with the superintendent of schools or the board of education for their salaries is largely past.
>
> In the present crisis, it is especially important that there be professional group action on salary proposals. A salary...committee is necessary. The committee should be chosen by the entire teaching group and should have authority to represent and act for the local education association. It is essential that the teaching group give this committee full authority to act, and then stand back of it.[54]

---

[52] Stanley Elam, "Collective Bargaining and Strikes or Professional Negotiation and Sanctions," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIV (October, 1962), pp. 1-11.

[53] R. B. Kennan, "The North College Hill Case," National Education Association Journal, XXXVI (February, 1947), p. 432.

[54] National Education Association Executive Committee, "The Professional Way to Meet the Educational Crisis," National Education Association Journal, XXXVI (February, 1947), p. 79.

Recent developments in "sanctions." In 1962, New York City teachers chose the United Federation of Teachers, an AFT affiliate, as their bargaining agent. This was the first instance of a large, metropolitan school district's engaging in formal collective bargaining. This activity, widely acclaimed as a union victory, aroused the NEA to more militant action in teacher welfare matters. The 1962 Convention adopted a Resolution on Professional Negotiation and in 1963 guidelines for implementing PN were distributed.[55] On October 19, 1963, guidelines for the implementation of professional "sanctions" were approved.[56]

NEA defines sanctions in the following manner:

> As used by a professional education organization, sanctions means censure, suspension or expulsion of a member; severance of relationship with an affiliated association or other agency; imposing of a deterrent against a board of education or other agency controlling the welfare of the schools; bringing into play forces that will enable the community to help the board or agency to realize its responsibility; or the application of one or more steps in the withholding of services. Sanctions are to be used only to improve educational opportunities through the elimination of conditions detrimental to effective education. The most severe types of sanctions should be invoked only as a last resort where conditions are such that it is impossible for educators to give effective professional service.[57]

---

[55] National Education Association, Guidelines for Professional Negotiation, (Washington: The Association, 1962)

[56] National Education Association, Guidelines for Professional Sanctions (Washington: The Association, 1963).

[57] National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Guidelines for Professional Sanctions (Washington: National Education Association, 1963), p. 9.

The clauses in the section which have been most controversial are the ones referring to the imposition "of a deterrent against a board of education" and to "the application of one or more steps in the withholding of services."[58] At this time, the application of sanctions against members of the profession is somewhat a background issue, as is the application of sanctions against an affiliated association. However, these applications will probably become increasingly important as teachers assume more and more responsibility for their actions and those of other educators.

Conditions requiring sanctions. The statement that "sanctions" are used only "to improve educational opportunities through the elimination of conditions detrimental to effective education" is open to considerable interpretation on the part of state and local associations. The statement that "severe types of sanctions should be invoked only as a last resort," requires the determination of what constitutes "a last resort." Richard B. Kennan, of NEA's Committee on Professional Rights and Responsibilities had this to say concerning the application of sanctions:

> For the teaching profession sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of its responsibility for self-discipline and for insisting upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education. Sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.[59]

---

[58] Ibid.

[59] Richard B. Kennan, "Professional Sanctions - Where, When and How," NEA Journal, LII (December, 1963), pp. 37-38.

NEA indicates that sanctions should be applied only in certain cases. Generally speaking, it is claimed they should be used for the long-range improvement of the pupil welfare, of school systems, and of the competence of members of the profession. Sanctions should be withheld until a comprehensive investigation under the direction of an official agency has been conducted. The investigation committee, NEA avers, should include a representative sample of the profession, with personnel involved who are experienced in making school problem studies. An attempt at mediation or negotiation should be made before the consideration of sanctions, and a warning given to the offending district that sanctions are being considered. Criteria for determining when conditions have been improved enough to revoke sanctions should be established before the utilization of this tool.[60] These criteria have been closely followed up to the present time.

Investigation of grievances. NEA requests that local associations request investigation by the state association before taking unilateral action, since the aid of the state association strengthens the local association's position. If NEA is to become involved in a "sanctions" situation, it makes an independent investigation of the circumstances before taking action. Investigations are conducted under the auspices of the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. The field work for these investigations is usually conducted by a committee of from five to seven individuals. NEA states that the primary duty of this committee is to elicit issues involved in the situation, obtain information enough for a careful analysis of the problem, and make a report of the investigation to NEA.

---

[60] National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

It is interesting to note that the investigation committee sent to Oklahoma spent less than a week in the state, returned to NEA and shortly thereafter issued a fifty page report, apparently based almost entirely on the findings of a committee appointed by the governor of that state, Mr. Bellmon.[61]

Following the report of the investigation, NEA makes a decision as to whether or not national sanctions will be imposed. During 1964, NEA imposed national sanctions against the state of Utah.[62] In 1965, sanctions were invoked against the state of Oklahoma. In both instances, educational improvements were forthcoming.

Forms of "sanctions." NEA states that "sanctions" may be applied against a school district, school board or other public agency through:

> 1. Censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special study reports, newspapers or other mass media....
> 2. Notification to state departments of education

---

[61] National Education Association. Oklahoma: A Statewide Study of School Conditions Detrimental to an Effective Educational Program (Washington: The Association, 1965).

[62] National Education Association. Utah: A Statewide Study of School Conditions (Washington: The Association, 1964).

> and other state agencies, public or private, responsible for or dedicated to the welfare of education;
>
> 3. Notification to state and national accrediting agencies of professionally unsatisfactory conditions in a school district;
>
> 4. Withholding of placement services, when the state association maintains a placement office; notice to public and private placement agencies of unsatisfactory conditions in a school district and request to observe professional disapproval;
>
> 5. Notification to members of the association of unacceptable conditions for employment in such a district and the professional significance of accepting or refusing employment in a school district against which sanctions have been invoked; (i.e. acceptance of employment in such a district could lead to expulsion from the professional association on ethical grounds).
>
> 6. Seeking state department of education or legal action to compel improvement of conditions threatening the welfare of the schools....[63]

At this time, no guidelines for withholding of services have been made available, but it is probable that the withholding of contracts, "professional holidays," and other strong forms of censure will come to be accepted practice in the professional association.

NEA position on teacher strikes. The NEA has no official strike policy in force. Arnold Wolpert, of the NEA's Division of Urban Services, indicates that the NEA recognizes the fact that strikes will occur from time to time, but that the organization officially feels they are not appropriate for use by teachers.[64]

---

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[64] Arnold Wolpert, from an interview at NEA Headquarters, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1966.

Strikes, it is argued, are "unprofessional" and serve only to foster ill-will and to identify the teachers as labor-type employees. Also strikes by public employees are illegal in most states. The arguments are inconclusive, with Lieberman presenting the strongest case for the strike and with representatives of NEA, supported by the National School Board Association and American Association of School Administrators, championing the non-strike cause.

NEA insists that the strike is not an appropriate weapon for teachers. To strike, NEA claims, would make teachers subject to labor law, with its voluminous precedent and statutory base. Such a position could also weaken the hold of NEA on the professional life of the teacher, rendering the AFT's position much stronger. It could render teacher-school board relations much more hostile. Bruce, in the American School Board Journal, had this to say:

> Whether or not it is illegal, the strike is not a weapon the teachers can use successfully. Any teacher strike is completely unprofessional. It is destructive of the dignity which teachers as professional men and women need to maintain... respect for the group responsible for the education of American youth and the future welfare of the nation.[65]

---

[65] W.C. Bruce (ed.), "An Illegal Strike," The American School Board Journal, CXLIV (June, 1962), p. 44.

A Legal Analysis of Collective Action by Teachers.

The law sees teachers as public employees, with concomitant responsibilities and obligations to the American people. An attempt is made in this section to determine the teachers' legal rights with regard to organization, negotiation, and coercive activities. Since there is relatively little legal precedent in connection with the activities of teachers associations per se, the discussion focuses primarily on public employee and teachers unions. The implications of the discussion for teacher associations are plain.

The Right to organize. The right of teachers "...peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances..." is couched in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. While professional associations and labor unions for teachers did not exist at the time the Constitution was written, there were relatively prominent labor guilds in England during the period. Had the framers intended to exclude such organizations from the protections of the First Amendment, they could have specifically done so. Their failure to mention such an exemption apparently indicates the desire of the authors to protect all citizens, whether organized or not, from oppressive governmental activity.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, with its stricture against state laws that "...abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States...(or that)...deny to any person...the equal protection of the laws..." serves to place upon the states a responsibility for protection of the same individual rights mentioned previously.

There has been some variation in the interpretations of state courts with regard to the rights of various classes of public employees in recent years, however. A number of decisions involving policemen held that these employees have no right to organize or to join labor unions. In recent cases tried in Missouri[66] and Michigan,[67] such unionizing prohibitions were upheld. The courts indicated that these rules did not violate the consitutional provision guaranteeing freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, and that they did not deprive members of the police force of due process or of their natural rights to liberty, the pursuit of happiness, or the enjoyment of their gainful efforts. Similar decisions involving policemen were handed down in California[68] and Mississippi.[69]

---

[66] King v. Priest, 206 S.W. (2d) 547 (1947).

[67] Local No. 201, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees v. City of Muskegon, 120 N.W. (2d) 197 (1963).

[68] Perez v. Board of Police Commissioners, 178 P (2d) 537 (1947).

[69] Jackson v. McLeod, 24 So. (2d) 319 (1946).

Policemen, firemen, and, to an extent, teachers, have been denied the right to join labor unions in various states, apparently on the assumption that such activity tends to interfere with proper performance of duty. Something of the attitude toward the duties and rights of policemen can be determined from the court's statement in McAuliffe v. City of New Bedford,[70] a Massachusetts case involving the discharge of a policeman for unauthorized political activity. It reads, in part:

> There is nothing in the constitution or the statute to prevent the city from attaching obedience to this rule as a condition to the office of policeman, and making it part of the good conduct required. The petitioner may have a constitutional right to talk politics, but he has no constitutional right to be a policeman.[71]

Substitution of the statement that the petitioner may have the right to organize, but no right to be a policeman, gives a clearer view of the thought on this matter in 1892. Tradition holds that public employees are the servants of the people, having fewer rights than other classes of citizen, since they have accepted certain obligations which make this condition necessary.

> ...the acceptance of a position involving the exercise of some degree of sovereignty necessarily implies a surrender of certain personal rights and privileges which...(are) inconsistent with the public interest.[72]

---

[70] 29 N.E. 517 (1892).

[71] Ibid.

[72] City of Pawtucket v. Pawtucket Teachers Alliance, 141 A. (2d) 624 (1958).

Two cases involving teachers directly are instructive. In People ex. rel. Fursman v. City of Chicago,[73] the Supreme Court of Illinois held that the local school board could enforce a rule prohibiting teachers from becoming union (and presumably teacher organization) members. The court held that membership in a union was inimical to proper discipline, prejudicial to the efficiency of the teaching force and detrimental to the schools' welfare. In Seattle v. Sharples,[74] the Washington courts held that a rule by the school district prohibiting the hiring of union members was valid and enforceable. The court said:

> It is no infringement upon the constitutional rights of anyone for the board to decline to employ him as a teacher in the schools, and it is immaterial whether the reason for the refusal to employ him is because the appellant is...or is not a (union) member...the board is free to contract with whomsoever it chooses.[75]

While the foregoing cases tend to place limitations upon teacher and other public employee organizational rights, there is a large body of precedent which supports the right of public employees to such activities. A number of states have enacted statutes specifically authorizing public employees to join and organize unions and other employee organizations.[76] Nine states have legislation specifically designed to protect the organizing rights of teachers.

---

[73] 116 N.E. 158 (1917).

[74] 293 Pac. 994 (1930).

[75] Ibid.

California's statute exemplifies this type of statute. The California statute states:

> Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join or assist labor organizations, to present grievances and recommendations regarding wages, salaries, hours and working conditions to the governing body through such an organization, but shall not have the right to strike...[78]

In Fellows v. LaTronica, (1962, Colorado), the following statement was made by Justice Pringle:

> ...that public employees may organize in unions and may designate a representative to present their views as to terms and conditions of employment to the body..setting such terms and conditions if the body chooses to hear them seems now to be generally accepted.[79]

---

[76] Calif., Conn., Florida, Hawaii, Mass., Michigan, Minn., N.J., New York, Oregon, R. I., Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

[77] Professional Negotiation with School Boards - a Legal Analysis and Review (Washington: NEA, 1965), pp. 21-22.

[78] West's California Government Code, Annotated, Secs., pp.3500-3509.

[79] 377 P. (2d) 547 (1962).

A Rhode Island court stated in 1958 that it recognized the teachers' "...right collectively as well as individually to present demands for just and reasonable remuneration for their services.[80]

Right to work laws. Right-to-work laws, which make unlawful various agreements requiring union membership as a condition of employment have been passed by at least twenty-one states.[81] They have the effect of prohibiting the "closed" or "union" shop prevalent in some areas of the country. Most of these right-to-work laws were intended to apply to private employment originally, but some could be made applicable to teachers and other public employees by judicial interpretation. This has already occurred in at least three instances.[82]

A number of cases have upheld the right-to-work principle for public employees. In the Norwalk case, the court ruled that "an agreement by the board to hire only union members would clearly be an illegal discrimination."[83] The Maryland courts ruled:

---

[80] City of Pawtucket v. Pawtucket Teachers Alliance, op. cit.

[81] Ala., Ariz., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ind., Iowa, Kansas, La., Miss., Nebr., Nev., N. C., N. D., S. C., S. D., Tenn., Texas, Utah, Va., Wyo.

[82] Beverly v. City of Dallas, 292S.W. (2d) 172 (1956). Potts v. Hay, 318S.W. (2d) 826 (Ark., 1958). Levasseur v. Wheeldon, 112N.W. (2d) 894 (S.D., 1962).

[83] Norwalk Teachers Association v. Board of Education, 83A (2d) 482 (1951).

> ...that a municipality...cannot discriminate in favor of members of a labor union... A citizen who is a member of a union cannot, by that fact alone, be barred from a position in public service.[84]

It was said of an Illinois ordinancy, in Fiske v. People, that:

> ...an ordinance requiring union labor only upon public improvements is unconstitutional and void, being an unjust discrimination between classes of citizens, which restricts competition and increases the cost of work.[85]

A third Illinois case included a strongly worded admonition:

> The question is, whether the board of education has a right to enter into a combination with... an organization...and to exclude any portion of the citizens following lawful trades and occupations from the right to labor. It has no such right.[86]

In 1959, the first case involving public school teachers in a dispute over union security clauses was tried.[87] The Montana Supreme Court held that such an agreement was null and void as to tenure teachers. The teachers had been told they must join the union or lose benefits from union-negotiated salary increases. The court ordered the school district to issue contracts to the tenure teachers with salaries calculated under the provisions of the union master agreement. The court indicated that "invalid and void provisions of a contract will be ordered by mandamus to be eliminated from the contract and the contract executed without such illegal provisions."[88]

---

[84] Mugford v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore. 44A (2d) 745 (1945).

[85] 188 Ill. 206 (1900).

[86] Adams v. Brennan, 177 Ill. 194 (1898).

[87] Benson v. School District No. 1 of Silver Bow County, 344P (2d) 117 (1959).

A Missouri court tried a similar case in 1961, but came to a different conclusion.[89] In this case a teacher failed to join several professional teachers associations as required by the board. The courts held that the board had the right to require teachers to join professional associations, that the board could "make all needful rules and regulations for the organization, grading and government in the school districts." Apparently the difference between this case and the Montana case, supra., lies in the fact that the defendant in the latter case had the option of negotiating individually for his compensation. He had the "right to work," although he had no tenure at the time of the suit and had not been rehired. Tenure status may have injected an element of coercion into the Montana case.

---

[88] Ibid. See also Tolman v. Underhill, 229 P. (2d) 447; Pallas v. Johnson, 68P. (2d) 559; and State ex.rel. United District Heating Inc. v. State Office Bldg. Commission, 179N.E. 138.

[89] Magenheim v. Board of Education of District of Riverview Gardens, 347 S.W. (2d) 409 (1961).

Also, it seems that the court felt that there was some difference between professional associations and unions. The court was high in its praise for professional organizations, indicating that "membership in professional organizations tends to improve the interests, knowledge, experience and overall professional competence."[90]

From the above discussion, it can be seen that, while some classes of public employees have often been excluded from union activities by law, the trend seems to be toward legalizing such activities for teachers, but with restrictions upon coercive membership requirements.

Right of teachers to bargain collectively. Having established the reasonableness of public employees' joining labor or professional organizations, the legal rights of these organizations to bargain collectively with their employers will be considered. Initially, it must be recognized that the employer is an agent of government in every case. The traditional view has been that agreements between government management and public employees are void.

A 1962 Colorado case indicates that "thus far no court has ruled as binding or valid any agreement between government management and public employees, whether consummated through a process of assumed 'collective bargaining' or 'collective negotiations,' or by any other semantic term."[91]

---

[90] Ibid.

[91] Fellows v. La Tronica, 377 P (2d) 547 (1962).

The reasoning is that public policy is a matter of legislative discretion which cannot be abdicated through such means. A number of forceful statements to this effect have been made in recent years. The Colorado courts indicated that collectively negotiated contracts "...would result in taking away from a municipality its legislative power to control its employees..."[92]

In City of Alcoa v. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 760,[93] the courts denied the right of unions to force public employers to collectively bargain. In the same decision it was indicated that the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act concerning collective bargaining did not apply to public employees.

A considerable number of decisions accord the legal right of limited collective bargaining to public employees. The limitation lies in the fact that public employees may not, by law, strike; since the ultimate weapon of collective bargaining has traditionally been the strike, some qualification is deemed necessary by the courts. In Norwalk Teachers Association v. Board of Education it was held that:

> ...there is no objection to the organization of the plaintiff as a labor union, but if its organization is for the purpose of 'demanding' recognition and collective bargaining, the demands must be kept within legal bounds. What we have said

---

[92] Ibid.

[93] 308 S.W. (2d) 476 (1957).

> does not mean that the plaintiff has the right to organize for all of the purposes for which employees in private enterprise may unite...[94]

The Norwalk case went on to say that the teachers association could organize and bargain collectively for the pay and working conditions which it might be within the board's power to grant.

The doctrine of illegal delegation of authority has been used frequently as a reason for refusal by boards to negotiate with teacher groups. One court circumvented this argument in the following manner:

> The presentation of a grievance is, in effect, a unilateral action, whereas a contract or agreement resulting from collective bargaining must of necessity be a bilateral procedure culminating in a meeting of the minds involved and binding the parties to the agreement. The presentation of a grievance is simply what the words imply, and no more.[95]

In this situation, the key to legality lies in the unilaterality of the confrontation. The board, apparently, is to listen passively while grievances are presented, and then act as it sees fit.[96]

The Right to strike. Traditionally, public employees have been denied the right to strike. The reasoning given is that public employment is non-profit, and that a strike against the public threatens state or national sovereignty. Despite the rigidly defined laws, over 1000 strikes have been conducted by government employees since 1880. In Norwalk Teachers Association v. Board of Education, the prevailing philosophy is set forth:[97]

---

[94] Norwalk Teachers Association v. Board of Education, 83A. (2d) 482 (1951).

[95] Beverly v. City of Dallas, op. cit.

[96] See also Dallas Independent School District v. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 330 S.W. (2d) 702 (1959).

> Under our system, the government is established by and run for all of the people, not for the benefit of any person or group. The profit motive...is absent. It should be the aim of every (government employee)...to do his or her part to make it function as efficiently and economically as possible. The drastic remedy of the organized strike...is in direct contravention of this principle.[98]

This philosophy has been almost universally upheld. Calvin Coolidge said, following the famous Philadelphia Police strike, that "...there is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, at any time."[99] Some recent interpretations, however, hold that school teaching does not affect the public safety, in which case teachers might be accorded the right to strike. In line with his thinking, a consideration of the Minnesota statute concerned with public strikes is instructive. The statute (M.S.A.C. 185, Sec. 185, 10) reads in part:

> ...no court of this state shall have jurisdiction to issue any restraining order, or temporary or permanent injunction, in any case involving or growing out of any labor dispute...

---

[97] Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965), p. 262.

[98] 83A. (2d) 482 (1951).

[99] Labor Law Journal 612.

A case concerned with this statute involved a group of school janitors who had threatened to strike against the district. The court refused to enjoin the strike, indicating that:

> It is apparent...that the legislature considered the bill applicable to public employees. (The legislature has)...concluded that there should be an exception only for firemen, policemen and other public officials charged with duties relating to public safety.[100]

Teachers, in this case, could probably strike to enforce their requests.

Fifteen states have anti-strike legislation on the books at this time. One of the most stringent pieces of legislation is New York's Condon-Wadlin Act, enacted in 1946. Until rendered inapplicable to teachers during 1967, it provided for immediate dismissal of such persons engaging in a strike. Despite the stringency of the law, New York teachers struck in 1961 and have threatened repetition almost every year since that time, an indication that the law was, for practical purposes, both useless and unworkable. A 1967 New York statute dealing with teacher organizational rights may serve to provide better remedies for the difficulties encountered within the state.

---

[100] Board of Education v. Public High School Employee Union, 45N.W. (2d) 797 (1951).

In several instances, public employees' strikes have been upheld by the courts. The Railway Union struck against the Los Angeles Transit Authority in 1960.[101] The court held that the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority Act of 1957 specifically included the right to strike. The act stated:

> Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other mutual aid and protection...[102]

The inclusion of the phrase "other mutual aid and protection" was interpreted by the courts to include the strike. The other two instances in which public employees have been upheld by the courts in their strike activities are Board of Education v. Public School Employees Union,[103] and Local 266 et. al. v. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District.[104]

These small chinks in the rigid non-strike armor could presage a more liberal court interpretation in the future. In Manchester v. Manchester Teachers Guild, a New Hampshire court handed down the following illuminating comments:

---

[101] Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority v. Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, 355 P. (2d) 905 (1960).

[102] Ibid.

[103] 45 N.W. (2d) 797 (1951).

[104] 275 P. (2d) 393 (1954).

> In the light of the increase in public employment... and the enactments in recent years guaranteeing the right of private employees to bargain collectively and to strike, it may seem anomalous and unfair to some that government should deny these same rights to its employees...However, any modification in the common law doctrine that the sovereignty of the state should not be hampered by strikes by public employees involves a change in public policy... Such a change is for the legislature to determine rather than... the court...

And in a Florida case: "There is no doubt that the legislature is free to provide by statute that public employees may enforce their right to collective bargaining by arbitration or strike."[105]

The latter three cases may be harbingers of change. Nevertheless, current legal thought holds that teachers and other public employees, unless specifically authorized to do so by statute, may not strike in enforcement of their collective demands. The fact that teachers and other groups of public employees are striking from time to time, in defiance of the laws as now written, is an indication of the felt need for some legitimate form of redress. In the event that viable alternatives to strike are not provided, this "illegal" form of activity will undoubtedly continue to appear in public sector negotiatory relationships.

---

[105] Miami Water Works Local 654 v. City of Miami, 26 So. (2d) 194 (1946).

Special Legislation Dealing with Public Employee Bargaining

By May 1, 1967, nine states had enacted special legislation designed to grant bargaining rights to public employees. A review of salient characteristics of the laws follows.

In four instances the legislation is all-inclusive, encompassing all personnel employed by the state. In five cases the legislation deals specifically and exclusively with public school teachers.

In four states a public agency is responsible for determining the unit of representation, conducting elections, and assisting in the settlement of disputes. In the other five, practice varies considerably.

In six of the states, representation is determined by secret ballot election, while in three other states, techniques such as dues deduction authorization and examination of membership lists are employed.

In four states a written agreement is required; in two written agreement is discretionary; and in three the law is silent.

In three states impasse is broken by fact finding; in four by advisory arbitration; in one by binding arbitration of all matters not involving monetary expenditures (Rhode Island); and in one (California) the law is silent.

In all nine state laws wages, hours, and working conditions are negotiable items. The generally loose wording of clauses dealing with negotiable items leads to the conclusion that most areas of educational concern could ultimately become subject to collective negotiation.

Six of the nine statutes prohibit strikes by public employees, while three are silent on this point. For a summary of public employee legislation currently in force, see Table I.

From the following review the reader can judge something of the "state of the art" in teacher collective negotiations. The nine state laws extant differ in various ways. Practice in the 41 states without laws is even more diverse at this time. In some states, such as Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Texas and West Virginia, school boards are forbidden to engage in collective bargaining with their employees. North Carolina statute forbids teachers and other public employees to join labor organizations, an interesting situation in view of the fact that over 85% of all North Carolina teachers are members of the state NEA affiliate--clearly a labor organization in the broader sense.[106]

The "crazy-quilt" of current law and practice makes for some confusion among those seeking an overall rationality in teacher negotiations, confusion which is not likely to be resolved in the foreseeable future. Prospects for national legislation regarding teacher negotiations within this decade are dim indeed, due to the below mentioned diversity of state and local environments.

---

[106] For a summary of state legislation, court decisions, and attorney generals' rulings in the area of public employment relationships, see Professional Negotiations with School Boards: A Legal Analysis and Review. (Washington: National Education Association, 1965).

TABLE I

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE BARGAINING STATUTES*

Date	State	Coverage	Bargaining unit determined by:	Type of representation	Representation determined by	Administrative agency for unit determination and elections	Contains specific unfair labor practices
1959-1961	Wisc.	All municipal and county employees.	Wisc. Employment Relations Board	Exclusive	Majority election	Wisc. Employment Relations Board	Yes
1965	Mich.	All public employees	Mich. Labor Mediation Board	Exclusive	Majority election	Mich. Labor Mediation Board	Yes
1965	Mass.	All city and county employees	Mass. Labor Commission	Exclusive	Majority election by secret ballot or other suitable means	Mass. Labor Relations Commission	Yes
1965	Conn.	Certificated, professional employees of a local board of education or school district	Impartial** ad hoc agency	Exclusive	Majority election	Ad hoc** neutral	No
1965	Wash.	All certificated public school employees.	...	Exclusive	Majority election	...	No
1965	Ore.	Certificated public school personnel below the rank of district superintendent.	District School Board	Teacher*** Council	Majority election	District School Board	No

Date	State	Coverage	Bargaining unit determined by:	Type of representation	Representation determined by	Administrative agency for unit determination and elections	Contains specific unfair labor practices
1965	Calif.	All certified public school employees	...	Proportional	Examination of membership list	...	Yes
1966	R. I.	Certified public school teachers. Superintendents, principals and asst. principals excluded	Statute	Exclusive	Majority election by secret ballot	Unit determined by statute. Election conducted by State Labor Relations Board	Yes
1967	New York	All public employees	Public Employee Relations Board	Exclusive	Dues deduction authorization or secret ballot	Public Employee Relations Board	No

* This table modified from R. E. Doherty, "The Law and Collective Bargaining for Teachers," *Teachers College Record*, LXVIII (October, 1966), 8-9.

** Local board and petitioning organization(s) choose neutral person or agency. Law provides elaborate procedure for resolving inability of parties to agree on neutral, but to date (March 1, 1966) these procedures have not been necessary.

*** Representatives elected by the teaching staff at large, no organizational representation, *per se*.

State	Specific bargainable issues	Agreement in writing	Impasses broken by	Method of selecting impasse breaker	Strikes
Wisc.	Questions of wages, hours, and conditions of employment	Yes	Fact finding	Appointed by Wisc. Employment Relations Board from list established by the Board or 3-member panel when jointly requested by both parties.	Prohibited
Mich.	Rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment.	If requested by either party	Tripartite Advisory Arbitration	Respective parties select 1 member each of tripartite panel. Two members so selected select a third party. If parties fail to agree, MLMB selects third party.	Prohibited
Mass.	Questions of wages, hours, and other conditions of employment	Yes	Fact finding	Mutual selection of fact finder from list of 3 proposed by Board of Conciliation and Arbitration--if fail to select within 5 calendar days, said Board selects.	Prohibited
Conn.	Salaries and other conditions of employment	If requested by either party	Advisory arbitration	Each party to dispute selects 1 arbitrator. So selected arbitrators select 3rd arbitrator.	Prohibited
Wash.	Proposed school policies relating, but not limited to, curriculum, textbook selection, inservice training, student teaching programs, personnel, hiring and assignment practices, leaves of absence, salaries and salary schedules and non-instructional duties.	...	Advisory arbitration	Appointed by Superintendent of Public Instruction.	...

State	Specific bargainable issues	Agreement in writing	Impasses broken by	Method of selecting impasse breaker	Strikes
Ore.	Matters of salaries and related economic policies affecting professional services.	...	Advisory Arbitration	District School Board and employees each select one member--so selected members select 3rd member.	...
Calif.	Matters relating to employment conditions and employer-employee relations, including but not limited to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment--also, matters relating to the definition of educational objectives, determination of the content of courses and curricula, selection of textbooks, and other aspects of the instructional program to the extent such matters are within the discretion of the public school employer or governing board under the law.	...	...	...	...
R. I.	Hours, salary, working conditions and other terms of professional employment.	Yes	Arbitration binding on all matters not involving expenditure of money.	Respective parties select 1 member each of tripartite panel. Two members so selected select a third member. If parties fail, American Arbitration Association appoints a third member or other mutually arrived at method.	Prohibited
New York	Hours, salary, wages and other terms and conditions of employment.	Yes	Mediation and fact finding	Appointed by the PERB-3 members from a list maintained by them for that purpose.	Prohibited

Those seeking a broad understanding of the situation must study individual states and cities in order to achieve intellectual satisfaction. This method, while often frustrating and time consuming, is the most reasonable and productive now available.

Conclusions

In this chapter professional negotiations and "sanctions" have been defined and discussed in ideological and empirical terms. A discussion of the legal precedents surrounding the process, and a brief history of negotiations and "sanctions" were presented, along with a brief discussion of legislation in force in this area.

From the foregoing material it becomes apparent that considerable militancy is currently being manifested by American teachers, or a representative group there of. Male secondary school teachers are supplying primary leadership for the movement, apparently in an attempt to: 1) raise the economic status of teachers; 2) reconcile their "bureaucratic employee" image with the developing "professional image" they apparently wish to cultivate.

A power struggle of sizeable proportions has developed between the NEA and AFT concerning organizational representation of teachers in negotiations with boards of education. The union has made considerable gains in urban areas, while the NEA is generally stronger in the suburbs and rural areas.

Current legal thinking on the subject of public employee collective bargaining is in flux. In a few cases legislators have been presented with the "fait accompli" of collective negotiations within their states and, in some cases, have moved to enact suitable legislation covering the situation. In most states, however, no legislation has been forthcoming to date, either as a result of legislative "foot-dragging" in the face of obvious need, or due to the fact that negotiation is not now occurring within the state. Time and circumstance will no doubt remedy this situation.

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLLECTIVE ACTION SCALES

The measurement of attitudes has had a long and relatively controversial history, due in part to the fact that since attitudes are conative, or affective in nature, their measurement must be indirect. Guilford defines an attitude as follows:

> ...a personal disposition common to individuals, but possessed to different degrees, which impels them to react to objects, situations, or propositions in ways that can be called favorable or unfavorable. While attitudes are subject to change, their directions and strengths are sufficiently enduring over periods of time to justify treating them as personality traits... The logic behind the use of opinions to measure attitudes is that there is a positive correlation between what people say on a subject and what they will do about it.[1]

That a necessary correspondence between overt behavior and attitudes exists is not universally accepted, as is pointed out by Edwards[2] and by Murphy and Likert; who make the following comments:

> Contemporary definitions cluster about two chief conceptions: first, that attitudes are dispositions toward overt action; second, that they are verbal substitutes for overt action. The former usage seems to the present writers to be preferable. The verbal declarations of opinions and attitudes are regarded as an indirect method of measuring dispositions which are most

---

[1] J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1954), p. 457.

[2] Allen L. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), p. 7.

easily signified and expressed in verbal form.[3]

The present research is predicated on the Likert assumption that attitudes do, in general, presage overt action, and that information collected by attitudinal devices can serve as an index of projected respondent activity, crude though the index may be.

Likert Scale Construction

The technique utilized for scale construction was that of Likert, whose method of "summated ratings" is well known in the field of scale construction.[4] In this system, total scores for individuals are obtained by summing their scores on individual scale items. Each item response is considered to be a rating, or miniature scale, measuring the degree of respondent affect toward an empirical referent. Likert discovered that scoring patterns based on the allocation of integral weightings correlate almost 1.00 with more complicated techniques, such as the normal deviate system, and that they are easier to apply than the method of "equal appearing intervals." This high correlation and relative simplicity caused this researcher to opt for "summated rating" scaling.

In development of the scales, an initial group of 104 items was drawn from the literature on collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes. (Appendix A) These items were chosen for their "value-laden" characteristics, their lack of dependence upon the respondent's substantive knowledge of collective negotiations, so that their presentation would permit respondent "value judgments," or conative responses. In accordance with Likert's instructions, for approximately half the items agreement indicates a favorable attitude toward the area of consideration, while for the other half, agreement indicates a negative disposition thereto. This technique is designed to identify instances of response set by providing a ready method of identifying inconsistent response patterns.

---

[3] Gardner Murphy and Rensis Likert, Public Opinion and the Individual (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938), p. 28

[4] Edwards, op. cit., p. 151.

Responses were scored on a five point unfavorable-favorable continuum, on the assumption that attitudes are quantifiable and can be assigned discrete score values. The continuum runs from 1 to 5, with high scores arbitrarily assigned to those responses favoring collective negotiation, "sanctions," or strikes. The scoring pattern is as follows:

5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree

For approximately half the items, the scoring pattern has been reversed, as explained above, to allow for ready identification of "response set."

At the outset of the study, the assumption was made that the concept "collective negotiations" is composed of several facets, including attitudes toward the negotiatory process, "sanctions," and strike. Initially, it was assumed that these facets could be measured through use of a single scaling device. Later in the study it became evident that there were, in fact, several scales within the inventory and that separate analysis was required for each.

Pilot Project

The 104 items mentioned previously were examined and criticized on content and construction by a group of twenty judges, i.e. persons knowledgeable in the field. The modified items were then submitted to a group of 100 graduate students in Education, who were familiar with collective negotiations. Their responses were tabulated and subjected to item-analysis, utilizing the standard Likert technique.[5] This technique allowed determination of those items which discriminated most effectively between the high scoring and low scoring groups involved. It was determined that 36 items of the original 104 were significant at or beyond the .01 level in their discriminative ability. Thirty of the best items were selected for the next step in the pilot project. (Appendix B)

At this point, a new sample of 100 teachers and 50 administrators, who were at the time graduate students in Education, were chosen to complete the 30 item group identified through item-analysis. This exercise served the function of securing preliminary reliability and validity information. The critical predictions had been made that the items would discriminate successfully between groupings based on position (i.e., teacher-principal) and between groupings based on sex (i.e., male-female).

---

[5] Formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_H - \bar{X}_L}{\frac{(X_H - \bar{X}_H)^2 + (X_L - \bar{X}_L)^2}{n(n-1)}}$$

Where X_H = high group, composed of 25% of subjects with highest score totals. X_L = Low group, composed of 25% of subjects with lowest score totals. For a complete statement of technique see Edwards, op. cit., p. 153.

These predictions were borne out. Analysis of variance showed that teachers score significantly higher than principals ($F = 16.95$, $p = .001$ with $df = 1$ and 148). Males were shown to score significanlty higher than females, also ($F = 7.38$, $p = .01$ with $df = 1$ and 98).

When hypotheses are tested, they should represent testable ideas having logical validity to the researcher. The above predictions were based on the assumptions that: 1) male and female teachers, having different career aspirations and economic goals, are likely to differ in their orientations toward collective action; 2) teachers and principals, occupying positions with different role expectations, are likely to differ in their orientations toward collective action. The data supported these predictions, supplying preliminary construct validity information.

Reliability Estimate

Also at this time, an estimate of split-half reliability was made by dividing the items into two similar sub-groups, composed of odd and even items. Having obtained the coefficient of correlation between odd and even items, which coefficient represented the reliability of a test one-half the length of the original test, the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was employed to obtain an estimate of the reliability for a test twice as long as either of the half tests.[6] (i.e., of the original length)

---

[6] Spearman-Brown prophecy formula: $r_{ww} = \frac{2r_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}}{1 + r_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}}$

Where r_{ww} = coefficient of reliability

$r_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}$ = coefficient of even-odd correlation

The split-half reliability coefficient, which is a coefficient of internal consistency, is used to indicate "how closely the obtained score comes to the score the person would have made...if we had had a perfect measuring instrument."[7]

In this instance, the coefficient of split-half reliability was .84 which was considered marginal, given Edward's comment that "...typical reliability coefficients are above .85."[8]

However, the reliability and validity of the inventory was adjudged satisfactory to work with the group at hand. It was decided to defer factor analysis until the larger sample was available.

Sample Selection

The population for the next stage of the study included all classroom teachers and all classified principals in North Carolina (1966 statistics indicated total of 46,809). Assistant principals and supervisors, superintendents and other central office personnel were excluded from the study. The population was categorized for sampling purposes on the basis of sex and position. This technique was employed in order that more ready identification of groups with which response variance could be associated might be facilitated.

---

[7] J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 452.

[8] Edwards, op. cit., p. 156.

The sample was chosen through use of a probability sampling formula designed to give an accuracy of plus or minus 5% with a confidence level of 90%. (Appendix C) This formula was applied separately to each of the four subsets, yielding a sample size of 1,249. This technique, while assuring the desired accuracy and confidence levels, rendered somewhat equivocal broad generalizations based on subset combination, due to disproportionality of subset representation.

Sampling procedure was as follows: From the total principal population (1,768), every fifth person was selected, yielding a subset total of 345. For male teachers (9900), every twenty-sixth person was chosen, yielding a subset total of 399. For female teachers (34,974), every ninetieth person was chosen, yielding a subset total of 388.[9] The population of female principals (167) was so small as to necessitate hand sampling. Using a table of random numbers, a subset of 117 was drawn.[10]

Subjects were contacted by mail, each individual receiving a first class letter requesting his participation in the study, a copy of the instrument, and a stamped, addressed envelope for returning the completed materials.

---

[9] The assistance of Mr. William Peek, Director, and Mr. Marvin Scarboro, both of the Statistical Services Office of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, is gratefully acknowledged.

[10] James E. Wert et. al., Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), pp. 416-417.

Two weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up postcard was dispatched to non-respondents. A second follow-up, sent one month after the initial mailing, consisted of a letter strongly urging cooperation, a second copy of the instrument, and another stamped, addressed envelope. Copies of the various letters and the instrument have been incorporated as Appendix E.

Of the 1249 persons contacted, 888 useable returns, or 71%, were received. Another 3% were returned in non-useable form, bringing the total response to 74%. Obviously a return of 74% precludes firm generalizations from the sample to the statewide population. Analyses are, therefore, in terms of the sample data only.

TABLE II

Sample Data Statistics

Category	Total pop.*	Sample Size
^{M}principal	1,768	345
^{F}principal	167	117
^{M}teacher	9,900	399
^{F}teacher	34,974	388
TOTAL:	46,809	1,249

* Figures supplied by Statistical Services Office, N. C. State Department of Public Instruction.

Factor Analysis

In order to identify the facets or dimensions in the inventory as then constituted, a principal axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation of factors was performed, a technique designed to extract the maximum amount of variance and to give the smallest possible residuals. It has the advantage of condensing the correlation matrix into the least number of orthogonal factors, which renders interpretation more straightforward.[11]

Intercorrelations of the 30 items were computed, yielding an R matrix (Appendix D) which was then factor analyzed.[12] The analysis identified seven factors, three of which were considered significant, since they appropriated 37% of the total common variance.[13] These three factors became the basis for the CA I, CA II, and CA III scales. The rotated loadings for the three factors are given in the V matrix, Table III. The items included in the CA I, II, and III Scales were chosen from the factors on the basis of their high factor loadings and logical validity. In only three instances are the loadings less than .60.[14]

---

[11] Benjamin Fruchter, Introduction to Factor Analysis (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1954), pp. 99-127.

[12] The F Matrix (unrotated factor loadings) is included in Appendix D.

[13] Eigen values: Factor I - 23%; II - 7%; III - 7%; IV - 5%; V - 5%; VI - 4%; VII - 4%

[14] .30 was arbitrarily chosen as the cutoff point for item selection.

TABLE III

V Matrix

CA I Scale

Rotated Factor Loadings*

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
11	.65	.04	.23	.03	.11	.09	.08
12	.68	.02	.29	.01	.01	.19	.04
15	.66	.13	.15	.06	.04	.25	.14
17	.72	.03	−.03	.09	.07	.23	.004
19	.67	.05	.02	.09	.04	.22	.01

CA II Scale

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
21	.09	.68	.09	.14	.02	.09	.32
22	.14	.85	.15	.06	.02	.20	.08
23	.09	.84	.17	.07	.003	.23	.10
27	.43	.33	.29	.02	.08	.03	.17

CA III Scale

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
3	.06	.16	.48	.35	.04	.25	.24
10	.13	.04	.77	.06	.20	.05	.02
13	.27	.15	.76	.04	.02	.13	.01
14	.20	.11	.80	.08	.07	.11	.03
25	.41	.15	.41	.08	.14	.03	.08

* All factors "reflected" to yield positive values

The items selected for each of the three scales intercorrelate highly, with all values significant at the .01 level. (Table IV) This is an indication of cohesiveness. Intercorrelations among the three groups of items were computed (Appendix D), in order to determine their independence. Although the intercorrelations are often significant, they are all in the low .20's, a fact which rendered their effect on validity dubious.[15]

The CA I Scale, composed of five highly loaded items (average loading = .69) is a cluster dealing with the collective negotiations process. (Table V, p. 89) Each item expresses an ideological commitment negative to the negotiations process. The items are notable for the extreme bias expressed in each. It is to be expected that educators strongly agreeing with each of these items would be militantly anti-negotiation in outlook. The split half reliability for CA I, using the Spearman Brown prophecy formula, is .82.

The CA II Scale, a cluster of four items (average loading = .68), deals with the "sanctions" process as espoused by the NEA. Three of the items express ideologically positive concepts, while the fourth is negative in tone. The fourth item in CA II is the weakest of the three scales, having a loading of only .33. The logical validity of arguments for inclusion of this item are strong, however. Split half reliability for CA II, Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, is .82.

---

[15] Average r for CA I - CA II = .21; average r for CA I - CA III = .24; average r for CA II - CA III = .25.

TABLE IV

Intercorrelations of Items in Factors I, II, and III

CA I COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION

	11	12	15	17	19
11	1.00				
12	.53	1.00			
15	.41	.47	1.00		
17	.41	.44	.51	1.00	
19	.37	.39	.41	.49	1.00

CA II "SANCTIONS"

	21	22	23	27
21	1.00			
22	.55	1.00		
23	.55	.80	1.00	
27	.28	.31	.34	1.00

CA III STRIKES

	3	10	13	14	25
3	1.00				
10	.37	1.00			
13	.37	.57	1.00		
14	.43	.58	.65	1.00	
25	.24	.34	.37	.39	1.00

TABLE V

Factor Loadings of Items and Average Loadings
CA I, II and III Scales

CA I - Collective Negotiation

Items		Factor Loadings
11.	I feel that the good teacher can always get the salary he needs without resorting to collective negotiations.	.65
12.	I believe that collective bargaining, alias professional negotiation, is beneath the dignity of teachers.	.67
15.	I feel that collective negotiations is chipping away by inches at local control and should be resisted.	.67
17.	I think collective negotiations by teachers organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship by the teachers.	.74
19.	I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective negotiations are insincere power seekers who do not have the best interests of education at heart.	.70
	Average Loading =	.69

CA II -"Sanctions"

21.	I think teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances.	.68
22.	I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of teacher responsibility for self-discipline and for insistence upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education.	.85
23.	I believe sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.	.84
27.	I believe that any teacher sanction or other coercivemeasure is completely unprofessional.	.33
	Average Loading =	.68

TABLE V (Con't.)

CA III - Strikes Items		Factor Loadings
3.	Teachers should be able to withhold services under certain conditions.	.48
10.	Teachers should not strike in order to enforce their demands.	.77
13.	I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.	.76
14.	I feel that the teacher cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust.	.80
25.	I feel that the traditional position that teachers, as public employees, may not strike is the only defensible position for a school district to take.	.41
	Average Loading =	.64

The CA III Scale, a five item cluster (average loading = .64) deals with the concept of strike as practiced in the private sector of the American economy. Four out of five items reflect negatively on the strike in public education, while one supports this concept. The items are quite homogeneous in general tone, lending an atmosphere of cohesiveness to the scale. Split half reliability for CA III is .83.

From this analysis, it appears that there are present three important factors, each of which taps a discrete facet of the overall collective action process. Any hypothesis as to the "real" nature of a factor is, of course, subject to further empirical validation prior to its acceptance with finality. The evidence at hand lends strong support to the validity of these factors, however.

Utilizing the items contained in the three factors which display the highest factor loadings, three scales, the CA I, CA II and CA III, have been constructed. High item intercorrelations indicate a considerable degree of cohesiveness within scales and logical validity arguments support the inclusion of the various items.

It is felt that the procedure followed is something of an improvement over the traditional Likert or Thurstone techniques of scaling, in that some information as to the "true" factors behind the attitudes being measured is provided by the analysis. Thus, the technique probably represents a departure from the oft-ridiculed "mindless empiricism" to which educational researchers fall prey on occasion. Hopefully, it affords a more accurate idea of what is actually being measured by the scales at hand, rather than what the researcher simply suspects to be the case.

On the assumption that CA I, II, and III represent valid dimensions of the collective negotiations process, these scales are used as the basis for further analysis of the data. Chapter IV treats the findings at some length.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF COLLECTIVE ACTION DATA

> "The hypothesis is the connecting link between two worlds: The world of explanation and theory and the empirical world of phenomena and fact. The very task of science is to furnish phenomena in the empirical world with explanations..."[1]

Hypotheses, when utilized in research activities, generally represent testable ideas having a certain degree of logical validity, from the researcher's point of view. In this analysis, hypotheses based on the sex and organizational position of North Carolina educators are examined in some detail. In line with the findings of the pilot study, the conceptual hypothesis that male educators are more favorably inclined toward teacher collective action, including collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes, than are female educators, has been tested. Also tested was the conceptualization that classroom teachers are more favorably inclined toward teacher collective action, including collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes, than are principals. On the basis of the scoring pattern employed, they should score higher on the scales.

The operational hypotheses utilized in the analysis of data are as follows:

1. Male educators will score higher on items dealing with collective negotiations ("sanctions," strikes) than female educators.

---

[1] W. W. Charters, Jr. "The Hypothesis in Scientific Research" (University of Oregon, 1967) Unpublished paper. Mimeographed, p. 2.

2. Teachers will score higher on items dealing with collective negotiations ("sanctions," strikes) than principals.

3. Interaction effects in scoring patterns based on sex and position will manifest themselves on items dealing with collective negotiations ("sanctions," strikes).

The collective action data were analyzed by use of two-part analysis of variance,[2] a procedure yielding F values for sex, position and interaction effects. The 5 percent level of significance was chosen. (Table VI)

In additon to hypothesis testing, the study served a hypothesis-generating function. In line with this approach, addtional analyses have been made, based on various categorizations appearing logically to contain potential response variation of significant proportions. This part of the analysis answered the following questions of potential significance.

1. How does the length of time educators have dwelled in the state affect their responses to items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes?

2. How does the educational level of educators affect their responses to items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes?

3. How does the type of school unit in which employed (i.e., city v. county) affect the responses of educators

---

[2] James E. Wert, et. al., Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), pp. 197-199.

to items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes?

4. How does the size of the town of residence affect the responses of educators to items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes?

5. How does length of experience affect the responses of educators to items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes?

6. How does the level at which employed (i.e., elementary-secondary affect the responses of educators to items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes?

7. How does level of certification affect the responses of educators to items dealing with collective negotiations, "sanctions,"and strikes?

The latter analyses were conducted utilizing two-part analysis of variance. In this instance, position was held constant (i.e., analysis was run first on teachers, then on principals) and a blocking procedure was employed for sex. It was decided to observe the interaction of the sex variable with the other variables under consideration, since it had been shown during the pilot study that sex is a major contributor to response variance. In addtion to providing valuable interaction information, inclusion of the sex variable had the effect of reducing the error term, thus increasing the sensitivity of the analysis of variance. (Tables VIII - X)

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Collective Negotiations Scale (CA-I)

The collective negotiations scale, it will be recalled, measures attitudes toward the process of collective bargaining or negotiations in public education. In general, scoring on the collective negotiations scale (CA-I) indicates that a majority of the sample are relatively uncommitted or undecided in their attitudes toward the collective negotiations process. This finding is based on mean scores for the various subsets, which tended to cluster near the midpoint of the scoring continuum. This general clustering did not prevent the appearance of significant differences in subset response, however. Subset means and standard deviations are included in Table VII.

The hypothesis that "male educators will score higher than female educators on items dealing with collective negotiations" was confirmed by the analysis. A significant F based on sex differences was obtained. (Table VI)

Male teachers scored approximately one-half standard deviation above the midpoint on the collective negotiations scale (CA-I), a fact which identifies them as being the group most favorably disposed toward the collective negotiations process. The other three subsets scored at or around the midpoint, an indication that they are undecided in their attitudes toward collective negotiations.

TABLE VI

Two-Part Analysis of Variance

Collective Negotiations - CA-I

Main Hypotheses

H_1 - Hypothesis	Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
Male educators will score higher on items dealing with Collective negotiations than female educators.	Sex	1	357.89	19.55	.01
Teachers will score higher on items dealing with collective negotiations than principals.	Position	1	103.41	5.65	.05
A significant interaction effect based on sex and position will occur.	Interaction	1	7.20	.394	n.s.

Within 884

The hypothesis that "teachers will score higher on items dealing with collective negotiations than principals" was confirmed by the analysis. A significant F based on position differences was obtained. (Table VI)

While the scores of all groups were relatively near the midpoint, which is 15, male teachers (17.1) scored higher than male principals, (16.1), and female teachers, (15.1), scored higher than female principals, (14.9). However, the scores of male principals are somewhat higher than those of female teachers, a fact which seems to indicate that sex is a more important determinant of attitudes toward collective negotiations than is position. The size of the respective F values supports this conclusion. Means and standard deviations for the subsets are reported in Table VII.

The hypothesis that "interaction effects in scoring patterns based on sex and positon will manifest themselves on items dealing with collective negotiations was rejected, since the F value obtained did not achieve significance at the .05 level.

"Sanctions" Scale (CA-II)

The "sanctions" scale, as previously explained, measures attitudes toward various forms of militant or coercive activity. Usually, "sanctions" are employed by educators in an attempt to enforce certain demands made on the school board.

Table VI (Con't)

Two-Part Analysis of Variance -"Sanctions" (CA-II)

Main Hypotheses

H_1 = Hypothesis	Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
Male educators will score higher on items dealing with "sanctions" than female educators.	sex	1	171.09	14.89	.01
Teachers will score higher on items dealing with "sanctions" than principals.	position	1	111.96	9.74	.01
A significant interaction effect based on sex and position will occur.	interaction	1	2.86	.249	n.s.

Within 884

As in the case of CA-I, scores of the sample group tend to cluster around the midpoint of the scale, an indication of indecisiveness on questions dealing with the "sanctions" process. While clustering is evident, significant differences in subset response have been identified.

The hypothesis that "male educators will score higher on items dealing with 'sanctions' than female educators" was confirmed by the appearance of a significant F score based on the effect of position.

Male teachers made the highest mean scores (13.1), an indication that they are the group most favorably disposed toward the use of "sanctions." Female principals scored lowest on the CA-II Scale (11.3). They are thus least favorably inclined toward the "sanctions" process.

The hypothesis that "a significant interaction effect based on sex and position will occur" was rejected, as the interaction score failed to achieve significance at the .05 level.

The Strike Scale (CA-III)

The strike scale, as its name implies, measures the attitudes of the sample toward the use of traditional private sector strike techniques in public education.

The hypothesis that "male educators will score higher on items dealing with strikes than female educators" was confirmed by the appearance of a significant F value based on the effect of sex. (Table VI, continued)

Table VI (Con't)

Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Strikes (CA-III)

Main Hypotheses

H_1 - Hypothesis	Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
Male educators will score higher on items dealing with strikes than female educators.	sex	1	361.48	18.29	.01
Teachers will score higher on items dealing with strikes than principals.	position	1	454.5	22.99	.01
A significant interaction effect based on sex and position will occur.	interaction	1	22.39	1.13	n.s.
	Within 884				

The hypothesis that "teachers will score higher on items dealing with strikes than principals" was confirmed by the appearance of a significant F value based on the effect of position.

The scores achieved by the various subsets indicate considerable antipathy toward utilization of strikes in the public schools. Male teachers scored near the midpoint (14.7) of 15, an indication that they are relatively uncommitted on the issue. However, male principals (12.7), female teachers (12.9) and female principals (11.6) were more negative in their responses. The result in this case is an unmistakable indication of a negative commitment with regard to the use of strikes.

The hypothesis that "a significant interaction effect based on sex and position will occur" was rejected, since the F value based on interaction failed to achieve significance at .05 level.

Hypotheses Generating Questions

A number of questions designed to serve a hypothesis generating function were posed and additional analyses were made based on several variables having a degree of logical validity in an attempt to isolate additional sources of significant response variance. Two-part analysis of variance was the analytical tool utilized.

In this set of analyses, position was held constant and a blocking procedure was employed for sex. Thus, teachers and principals were considered separately.

TABLE VII

Subset Means and Standard Deviations for the CA I, CA II and CA III Scales

Subset	N	$\bar{X}$*	S.D.
Collective Negotiations (CA-I)			
Male teacher	254	17.1	4.7
Female teacher	271	15.5	4.1
Male principal	277	16.1	4.2
Female principal	86	14.9	4.0
"Sanctions" (CA-II)			
Male teacher	254	13.1	3.7
Female teacher	271	12.3	3.3
Male principal	277	12.5	3.3
Female principal	86	11.3	3.0
Strikes (CA-III)			
Male teacher	254	14.7	5.0
Female teacher	271	12.9	4.2
Male principal	277	12.7	4.4
Female principal	86	11.6	4.0

*Midpoints for CA I, CA-II and CA-III, respectively are: 15, 12 and 15.

The sex variable was included in each analysis to measure the interaction of this proven discriminative factor with other logically valid variables. The results of these analyses are reported in Tables VIII - X.

It can be seen from Tables VIII- X that the variance contribution of the additional variables is minimal. No significant differences based either on the dependent variables themselves or upon the interaction of sex and the dependent variables were obtained through use of two-part analysis of variance. This was true for separate teacher-principal treatment based on the Collective Negotiations Scale (CA-I), the "Sanctions" Scale (CA-II) and the Strikes Scale (CA-III). In no instance was a significant contribution to total variance discovered. In most instances the F score for sex, as would be expected on the basis of previous analysis, was significant. This finding provided no new information, however. The analyses performed seemed to indicate that the effects of sex and of organizational position account for most of the total variance in respondent scores. The implications of these findings will be discussed at greater length in Chapter V, "Discussion of the Results of Analyses of the Collective Action Scales."

TABLE VIII

Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Collective Negotiations (CA-I)

Hypotheses Generating Analysis - Position Held Constant
Teachers only

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
1. Length of residence in state.	1	57.50	3.01	n.s.
sex	1	182.54	9.54	.01
interaction	1	8.10	.42	n.s.
2. Educational level	1	.04	.002	n.s.
sex	1	302.28	15.70	.01
interaction	1	5.50	.28	n.s.
3. Type of school unit	1	39.42	2.05	n.s.
sex	1	342.30	17.84	.01
interaction	1	.15	.01	n.s.
4. Size of town of residence.	1	1.10	.58	n.s.
sex	1	35.40	18.60	.01
interaction	1	1.26	.07	n.s.
5. Length of experience	1	.25	.01	n.s.
sex	1	399.92	20.91	.01
interaction	1	69.01	3.61	n.s.
6. Level of employment	1	71.20	3.74	n.s.
sex	1	159.40	8.40	.01
interaction	1	18.56	.98	n.s.
7. Certification level	1	2.60	.14	n.s.
sex	1	3.60	18.73	.01
interaction	1	30.24	1.57	n.s.

Within 521

Table VIII (Con't)

Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Collective Negotiations (CA-I)

Hypotheses Generating Analysis - Position held constant
Principals only

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
1. Length of residence in state.	1	.08	.005	n.s.
sex	1	9.37	.55	n.s.
interaction	1	.0006	.00	n.s.
2. Educational level	1	.380	.02	n.s.
sex	1	41.56	2.43	n.s.
interaction	1	.96	.06	n.s.
3. Type of school unit	1	.77	.05	n.s.
sex	1	10.75	6.32	.05
interaction	1	34.00	2.00	n.s.
4. Size of town of residence	1	1.46	.09	n.s.
sex	1	98.77	5.77	.01
interaction	1	2.73	.16	n.s.
5. Length of experience	1	5.74	.34	n.s.
sex	1	13.12	.77	n.s.
interaction	1	4.76	.28	n.s.
6. Level of employment	1	.87	.05	n.s.
sex	1	32.50	1.90	n.s.
interaction	1	.15	.01	n.s.
7. Certification level	1	3.42	.20	n.s.
sex	1	122.89	7.2	.01
interaction	1	26.70	1.57	n.s.

Within 359

TABLE IX

Two-Part Analysis of Variance - "Sanctions" (CA-II)

Hypotheses Generating Analysis - Position held constant
Teachers only

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
1. Length of residence	1	4.00	.33	n.s.
sex	1	2.04	.17	n.s.
interaction	1	33.5	2.74	n.s.
2. Educational level	1	4.82	.39	n.s.
sex	1	76.70	6.25	.01
interaction	1	1.58	.13	n.s.
3. Type of school unit	1	25.00	2.06	n.s.
sex	1	13.30	10.94	.01
interaction	1	4.75	.39	n.s.
4. Size of town of residence	1	10.24	.84	n.s.
sex	1	118.10	9.70	.01
interaction	1	37.77	3.10	n.s.
5. Length of experience	1	.08	.006	n.s.
sex	1	87.44	7.12	.01
interaction	1	.87	.07	n.s.
6. Level of employment	1	.13	.01	n.s.
sex	1	58.77	4.80	.05
interaction	1	1.39	.11	n.s.
7. Certification level	1	.072	.006	n.s.
sex	1	83.87	6.83	.01
interaction	1	1.98	.16	n.s.

Within 521

Table IX (Con't)

Two-Part Analysis of Variance - "Sanctions" (CA-II)

Hypotheses Generating Analysis - Position held constant
Principals only

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
1. Length of residence	1	2.56	.24	n.s.
sex	1	20.86	1.99	n.s.
interaction	1	3.57	.34	n.s.
2. Educational level	1	4.11	.40	n.s.
sex	1	2.19	.21	n.s.
interaction	1	.47	.46	n.s.
3. Type of school unit	1	6.78	.65	n.s.
sex	1	96.43	9.26	.01
interaction	1	5.66	.54	n.s.
4. Size of town of residence	1	.0003	.000	n.s.
sex	1	78.74	7.53	.01
interaction	1	5.48	.52	n.s.
5. Length of experience	1	.95	.09	n.s.
sex	1	33.4	3.19	n.s.
interaction	1	.53	.05	n.s.
6. Level of employment	1	.46	.04	n.s.
sex	1	20.20	1.93	n.s.
interaction	1	.82	.08	n.s.
7. Certification level	1	.001	.000	n.s.
sex	1	19.66	1.89	n.s.
interaction	1	24.1	2.32	n.s.

Within 359

TABLE X

Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Strikes (CA-III)

Hypotheses Generating Analysis - Position held constant Teachers only

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
1. Length of residence	1	22.4	1.08	n.s.
sex	1	77.1	3.72	n.s.
interaction	1	22.6	1.09	n.s.
2. Educational level	1	6.71	.32	n.s.
sex	1	249.50	12.03	.01
interaction	1	40.80	1.97	n.s.
3. Type of school unit	1	3.31	.16	n.s.
sex	1	44.13	21.21	.01
interaction	1	1.78	.86	n.s.
4. Size of town of residence	1	61.80	3.00	n.s.
sex	1	467.51	22.62	.01
interaction	1	35.53	1.72	n.s.
5. Length of experience	1	24.8	1.20	n.s.
sex	1	252.40	12.16	.01
interaction	1	32.34	1.56	n.s.
6. Level of employment	1	15.74	.76	n.s.
sex	1	251.70	12.12	.01
interaction	1	9.64	.46	n.s.
7. Certification level	1	2.17	.10	n.s.
sex	1	316.59	15.19	.01
interaction	1	.41	.02	n.s.

Within 521

Table X (Con't)

Two-Part Analysis of Variance - Strikes (CA-III)

Hypotheses Generating Analysis - Position held constant
Principals only

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	f	p
1. Length of residence	1	8.18	.44	n.s.
sex	1	15.87	.86	n.s.
interaction	1	1.82	.09	n.s.
2. Educational level	1	10.92	.59	n.s.
sex	1	23.10	1.23	n.s.
interaction	1	7.64	.42	n.s.
3. Type of school unit	1	3.05	1.66	n.s.
sex	1	56.33	3.07	n.s.
interaction	1	4.35	.24	n.s.
4. Size of town of residence	1	2.27	.12	n.s.
sex	1	67.14	3.65	n.s.
interaction	1	.44	.02	n.s.
5. Length of experience	1	5.99	.33	n.s.
sex	1	27.05	1.50	n.s.
interaction	1	1.02	.06	n.s.
6. Level of employment	1	.62	.03	n.s.
sex	1	14.40	.78	n.s.
interaction	1	.76	.04	n.s.
7. Certification level	1	.64	.04	n.s.
sex	1	49.04	2.66	n.s.
interaction	1	.14	.01	n.s.

Within 359

Correlations Between Collective Action Scales and Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale

Collective action, a multi-faceted social force, can be thought of as a "forward-looking" or "liberal" trend in education. Given the basic commitment to change and the disregard for traditional bureaucratic patterns in favor of the basic needs of the individual professional, it seemed reasonable to posit a relationship between teacher militancy and the doctrine espoused by liberal groups, such as the now-defunct Progressive Education Association. Such groups tend to champion liberal educational ideas of various kinds. It seemed reasonable to suggest that persons favoring progressivist thought would be likely to favor militant collective action, another liberal social construct.

In 1902 John Dewey described two major schools of educational thought, which have since been called the progressive and traditional schools.[3] As later amplified upon by Kerlinger, the traditionalist favors external discipline, traditional subject matter curriculum and moral standards, and general authoritarianism in educational matters. The progressive, on the other hand, emphasizes self-discipline, a problem-solving approach, emphasis on children's interests and needs, and liberal social orientations which promote education as a change vehicle.[4] Teacher collective action appears to be related closely to the concept of social change and is antithetical, at least currently, to hierarchical authoritarianism.

---

[3] John Dewey, The Child and the Curriculum (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.)

Based on Kerlinger's results and rationale and on the results of the pilot study performed in connection with development of the Collective Action Scales, it was judged appropriate to perform an analysis designed to quantify the relationship, if any, between performance on Kerlinger's progressivism-traditionalism scale (ESI-AB), and CA Scales I, II and III.[5] The statistical vehicle employed was Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. This portion of the study was intended to generate hypotheses concerning relationships between progressive-traditional philosophies in education and the collective action movement. The following questions were asked and analyzed.

1. Is there a significant relationship between the scores of male teachers (female teachers, male principals, female principals) on Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale and on Collective Action Scale I (collective negotiations)?

2. Is there a significant relationship between the scores of male teachers (female teachers, male principals, female principals) on Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale and on Collective Action Scale II ("sanctions")?

---

[4] Fred N. Kerlinger, "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes," The Journal of Social Psychology, XLVIII (1958), p. 113.

[5] A more complete explanation of Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale is provided in Chapter VI.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the scores of male teachers (female teachers, male principals, female principals) on Kerlinger's ESI-AB Scale and on Collective Action Scale III (strikes)?

A tabular presentation of the results of this analysis is presented in Table XI.

It can be seen that the correlations between the collective negotiations scale (CA-I) and the progressivism-traditionalism scale (A-B) are significant for three of the four subsets, an indication that a degree of relationship exists between the scoring patterns of the respondents on the two scales. While the results are of sufficient magnitude to warrant some attempt at interpretation, they are adjudged to be rather marginal in nature. Conclusions drawn therefrom must be tentative, subject to further empirical validation.[6]

According to the data, a positive relationship exists between collective negotiations and progressivism-traditionalism, as measured by the CA-I and A-B scales.

The correlations split along position and, less clearly, along sex lines. Teachers' attitudes toward collective negotiations and toward progressivism-traditionalism are considerably more highly correlated than those of principals.

The correlations of male educators are, within position, higher than those of females. Female principals

---

[6] The truism that, given sufficient sample size, significant correlations can be obtained for almost any two columns of data warrants consideration in this instance.

TABLE XI

Product-Moment Correlations between Collective Action Scales I, II and III and Education Scale I-AB

Variables	N	r	p*
Collective Negotiations Scale (CA-I) and Progressivism Traditionalism Scale (A-B)			
Male teachers	254	.24	.01
Female teachers	271	.17	.05
Male principals	277	.136	.05
Female principals	86	-.095	n.s.
"Sanctions" Scale (CA-II) and Progressivism-Traditionalism Scale (A-B)			
Male teachers	254	.12	n.s.
Female teachers	271	-.009	n.s.
Male principals	277	.182	.01
Female principals	86	-.132	n.s.
Strike Scale (CA-III) and Progressivism-Traditionalism Scale (A-B)			
Male teachers	254	.15	.05
Female teachers	271	-.009	n.s.
Male principals	277	-.058	n.s.
Female principals	86	-.168	n.s.

* r's of .138 and .181 are significant at the .05 levels, respectively for male teachers, female teachers and male principals; r's of .217 and .283 are significant at the .05 levels, respectively for female principals.

manifest a low negative correlation, an indication that their attitudes toward the two constructs in question are not highly congruent. Their scores indicate a slight negative relationship between collective negotiations and progressivism-traditionalism. The answer to question one, above, is a qualified yes, subject to further empirical validation.

The relationship between attitudes toward "sanctions" and progressivism-traditionalism is shown by the data to be minimal. The correlation of only one subset, male principals, was of sufficient magnitude to attain significance. The correlations split on sex, with males attaining low positive correlations and females attaining low negative correlations. This is an indication that the two sexes do not perceive the constructs under consideration in a similar manner. The answer to question two, above, must be in the negative, based on the data at hand.

The strike scale (CA-III) and the progressivism-traditionalism scale (A-B) correlate only marginally. One subset, male teachers, obtained a significant correlation, while correlations of the other three subsets were low and negative. Male teachers apparently perceive some degree of relationship between the strike and the progressivism-traditionalism constructs, albeit at a low level. The correlations for the other three subsets were non-significant. From the results obtained it appears that the attitudes toward strikes and toward Dewey progressivism-traditionalism are independent. The answer to question three, above, must be in the negative given the data at hand.

The results of the analyses are treated more fully in Chapter V, "Discussion of the Results of Analyses of the Collective Action Scales."

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF ANALYSES OF THE COLLECTIVE ACTION SCALES

> It does not follow, because all of the individuals in a group would gain if they achieved their group objective, that they would act to achieve that objective, even if they were all rational and self-interested. Indeed, unless the number of individuals in a group is quite small, or unless there is coercion or some other special device to make individuals act in their common interest, rational, self-interested individuals will not act to achieve their common or group interests.[1]

The collective action movement in public education is objectified in the thrusts of two major educational groups, the NEA and AFT, each striving to gain for themselves additional authority and power over conditions of work and economic concerns. In this context, authority refers to legal and societal sanction of certain acts performed by a group. Authority confers the "right" to undertake certain activities as the need arises. Power refers to the capability of an individual or group to carry an activity or activities to a successful conclusion, as viewed by the actors. Individuals or groups can have power without authority, or authority without power. A healthy balance between the two is most desirable, as teachers are becoming more aware with the passage of time.

---

[1] Mancur Olson, Jr., The Logic of Collective Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), p.2.

3rd mrg

This drive for control is characteristic of the process through which vocations typically gain a higher status in the hierarchy of occupations. At the top of the hierarchy stand the professions, including the traditional vocations of law, medicine and the ministry. Scattered along a continuum leading from "true" professionalism to the lowest occupations in this status categorization are other vocations, of which teaching is one. Just where teaching lies on the continuum is moot. On the basis of training, the standing of teachers is relatively high. On the basis of economic rewards, teaching ranks considerably lower. In terms of such traditionally important structural characteristics of professions as: control of entry and exit, strong organization, and monopoly over a specialized body of information, teaching has for some time ranked far down the professional continuum. Assuredly, the current teacher militancy with which the public is faced is at least in part a result of the frustration of public school educators' desire for professional status, and of their striving for a higher niche in the occupational hierarchy.

Public education is faced with dualistic behavioral expectations. The public employee status of educators has for a long time been reinforced by traditions of local control of education and, more recently, by the development of urban educational complexes requiring ever-increasing amounts of administrative coordination.

Bureaucratic systems of this type normally tend to be antithetical to the development of professional ideology, placing constraints upon the educators which thwart the growth of professionalism.

As Solomon says: "A bureaucratic system tends to foster a controlled, routinized work situation, one that is not compatible with notions of professional autonomy or responsible participation in decisions relating to the work process, and certainly not compatible with the exercise of creativity or initiative."[2]

It is possible to think of professionalism in terms of a group of attributes, as listed above, or as a process, a developing conception. That is, professionalism can be thought of as process rather than status. Corwin puts it this way:

> A mature profession may be defined, structurally, as an organized vocation having a legal monopoly over procedures for applying a body of theoretical knowledge to social problems, which includes the occupation's control over the recruitment and policing of its own members. But it is perhaps more meaningful to look at emerging professions as vocations in process, rather than comparing them to fixed structural standards. In this case a drive for status, including militancy, is the important element.[3]

It is clear that process is dependent on people; that is, that no social movement can exist without people in motion, individuals in pursuit of their goals or felt needs. In the case of teacher militancy, educators must be responsible for any activity, positive or negative, which transpires in the area of collective action. To determine the state of teacher militancy, it is generally necessary to determine the thinking of those involved, and to document overt behavior related to the process. In the study at hand, overt behavior was, for all practical purposes, non-existent in early 1966, the time when the sample was contacted. For this reason informational reliance was placed exclusively upon the reactions of individual educators to the scales administered. This proved to be a useful approach to the solution of the problems involved in describing the status of teacher militancy in North Carolina.

---

[2] Benjamin Solomon, "A Profession Taken For Granted," School Review, LXIX (1961), 286-299.

[3] Ronald G. Corwin, "Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools," Cooperative Research Project No. 2637 (U. S. Office of Education, 1966), pp. 78-79.

The responses of the sample of North Carolina educators to the collective negotiations scale and the "sanctions" scale fell at or near the midpoint of the scale, an indication that the sample group is relatively undecided or attitudinally uncommitted to these constructs. (Table VII, Chapter IV). The sample reacted in a generally negative manner to items in the strike scale, with three subsets scoring ½ standard deviation or more below the midpoint.

Probably the uncommitted posture of the educators involved stems from their lack of experience with collective negotiations and "sanctions" procedures. As of early 1966, few exemples of overt teacher militancy of any type had been manifested in North Carolina.[4] One abortive attempt at unionization was undertaken in late 1965. At that time, a group of Chapel Hill teachers formed a new teachers organization, the North Carolina Organization of Teachers, apparently as a result of dissatisfaction with the conservative teacher welfare policies of the North Carolina Education Association (NCEA). The group did not affiliate with the American Federation of Teachers, but its officers were in touch with union officials. By mid 1967, the group had accomplished essentially nothing, and was apparently dormant.

In 1966, the NCEA appointed a committee to prepare guidelines for professional negotiation. The committee had produced nothing of substance by mid 1967, for reasons which are unclear. Also during 1966, the NCEA sponsored a weekend workshop on "Professional Cooperation." This was apparently a tentative effort to determine teacher reaction to the collective negotiations process. The meeting resulted in no substantive activity directed toward the establishment of collective negotiations in North Carolina.

The first "sanctions" activity in North Carolina was manifested in the spring of 1967, after the sample had been contacted. At that time, the taxpayers of Winston-Salem-

---

[4] An early (1946) conflict, called the "South-Piedmont" controversy, hinged on disagreement concerning the legislative program of the North Carolina Education Association, which was felt by a group of teachers from the Charlotte area to be inadequate. While the dissension was serious, no collective negotiations or "sanctions" resulted.

1 Forsyth County, defeated a special tax and bond levy which would have made possible a raise in salary for local teachers. Following the failure of the levy, the local teachers called for national, state and local "sanctions" against the school unit. The NEA and NCEA decided against such action, but the local teachers association invoked "sanctions" following the close of school in early June, 1967. The group issued statements calling the unit an unsatisfactory place to teach and asked that teachers avoid accepting employment in Winston-Salem until the "sanctions" had been lifted. At the time of this writing (June, 1967), the "sanctions" were still in effect.

With the few exceptions noted above, North Carolina educators have had no contact with the concepts of collective negotiations and "sanctions." The relatively undecided stance of the sample seems to support this fact.

The low scores attained by the sample on the strike scale are apparently a function of the general "anti-union" orientation of the populace. As a relatively non-unionized southern state with a long history of "union-breaking" activities, North Carolina has traditionally manifested antipathy toward organized labor and the tactics thereof. Additionally, teachers in North Carolina, as in other states, tend to subscribe to the "professional" dogma that the strike is an unacceptable activity for teachers to support or participate in. Assuming that the data is generalizable, the scores achieved by the sample are a clear indication that the strike is an indefensible form of behavior so far as North Carolina educators are concerned.

The hypotheses that "males will score higher than females" on the three scales were generally supported, although the significance of mean differences is, in some cases, dubious. The data indicate that male educators in the sample are more positive in attitude toward collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes than are female educators.

The possible explanations for this result are numerous. It could be argued that women tend, in general, to be more personally shy and conservative than men and that they, consequently, eschew militance whenever possible. It could also be posited that female educators are more committed to student welfare than to personal gain, while men are economically oriented. However, it is equally possible that women are less professionally oriented, less committed to teaching as a career then their male counterparts. This being the case, they would be less likely to support collective militance because for them the advancement of the teaching profession would not be criterial.[5] Goldhammer reports that

> Many women teachers are not professionally oriented toward their jobs. Some are married,

---

[5] It is assumed that teacher militance is a positive, rather than a negative, educational force.

> have children, and feel their first responsibility is to their homes and youngsters rather than to the school.[6]

The fact that many women are married persons supplementing their husbands' incomes is seen as contributing to differences between female and male attitudes toward the collective action process. Moskow points out that:

> 41% of all teachers are 'married women with their husbands present.' Thus, for a substantial portion of all public school teachers their salary is a 'second income' to the family, and as a result salary increases are probably not as crucial to this group as they are to primary income earners.[7]

Since 78% of all North Carolina teachers and 70% of the nation's teachers are female, this finding is a significant indicator of future activity in collective negotiations. It can be expected that militant activities will generally be inspired and led by male educators, who constitute a minority of the total teaching force.

Zeigler indicated that a majority of male teachers are upwardly mobile, economically speaking, while a majority of females are not upwardly mobile.[8] Since upwardly mobile persons are more likely to participate in activities perceived as capable of enhancing their status, this finding is seen as supporting the contention that males are the most likely candidates for leadership in the collective action movement. Corwin indicates that the most "belligerent professionals were more likely to be men than women... although some women did contribute militant leadership of a "milder form."[9]

---

[6] Keith Goldhammer et. al. Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration, U. S. Office of Education, Final Report No. 6-2423 (1967), pp. 37-38.

[7] Michael H. Moskow, "Teachers and Unions: An Analysis of the Applicability of Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers" (unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, The University of Pennsylvania, 1956), p. 97.

It is projected then, that the collective action movement will tend to be dominated by male educators, with female educators operating in a supportive role. As in most organized activities, the great majority of teaching personnel will be carried silently along, giving tacit consent to the actions of their more activist, generally male, leaders. To misquote Michels,[10] "Who says (militant educational) organizations says (male) oligarchy."

The general hypotheses that "teachers will score higher than principals" on the three scales were confirmed, although once again the significance of differences between mean scores is dubious in some instances. Within sex category, teachers' scores are consistently higher than principals'. There are several possible explanations for the scoring pattern manifested. Economically speaking, teachers have considerably more reason to be militant than principals. Few principals are forced to work at second jobs after school hours in order to survive, but in 1961 about 47.4% of the male teaching force and 7.6% of the female teachers held second jobs during the academic year.[11] Such a situation is both fatiguing and frustrating to the individuals involved, and no doubt fosters a mental climate receptive to militant suggestions. The problem falls mainly upon the male teacher. The statistics show that most females are apparently able to survive without recourse to "moonlighting."

---

[8] Harmon Zeigler, The Political World of the High School Teacher (Eugene: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1966), p. 152.

[9] Corwin, op. cit., pp. 456-457.

[10] Robert Michels, Political Parties (New York: The Free Press, 1949), p. 401.

Principals are less receptive to collective action than teachers for a second reason, this one involving questions of authority and power. There is little doubt that teacher collective action has as its major purpose the compromising of traditional administrative and lay control through gradual accretion of teacher prerogatives . As Wildman stated:

> The avowed theoretical purpose and practical effect of collective bargaining is to grant employee organizations an increased measure of control over the decision-making processes of management.[12]

---

[11] National Education Association, "American Public School Teachers," NEA Journal, LII (April, 1963), 48-51.

[12] Wesley A. Wildman and Charles R. Perry, "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, XVII (January, 1966), 245.

Naturally, the erosion of administrative authority is not pleasant for principals, as a group, to contemplate. It is logical that they should be somewhat less than enthusiastic concerning increasing encroachments upon their area of administrative discretion. Such encroachments tend to destroy the principal's power to act while leaving responsibility for events occurring within the school in his hands. This is a source of increasing irritation to principals. Reason says:

> As a school administrator, you are management. In the final analysis management is held responsible for the operation of the schools and management, not the school teachers, is judged deficient if the public considers the schools to be operating ineffectively. If management has this responsibility, then it must also retain commensurate authority to carry out this responsibility.[13]

With this type of thinking apparently the rule among public school principals, it is not surprising that their scores on the collective action scales tend to be lower than those of teachers. Even if it were the desire of principals to support teacher militancy, overt activity would be highly unlikely, since principals are hired to support board policy, not to further teacher goals per se. To employ administrative personnel who failed to carry out school board policies would be disastrous, from the board's point of view. As Lieberman and Moskow state: "Effective school administration would be impossible if administrative personnel were free to engage in activities designed to frustrate board policies."[14]

---

[13] Paul L. Reason, "Concerns of School Administrators About the Manifestations of Teacher Aspirations When they Result in Some Form of Collective Negotiations," Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools, Robert E. Doherty, ed. (Ithaca: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1967), pp. 20-21.

This being the case, it seems likely that those principals who are sympathetic to the goals of the teaching staff, because they "still think of themselves as teachers," or for other reasons, will tend to avoid overt display of such feelings. They will, for reasons of professional survival, increasingly hold themselves aloof from "political" activities such as salary negotiations, except as they directly affect administrator remuneration, and will demonstrate increasing interest in "professional" matters, such as supervision of instruction, curriculum, and operation of the plant. (Even these areas, incidentally, are becoming centers of controversy). Such a course of action seems, under the circumstances, to be quite rational.

Examination of the mean subset scores yields some interesting insights into the responses of the sample. Examination of Table VII, Chapter IV, shows that the scoring patterns tend to run as follows: male teachers score highest; female teachers and male principals score at or near the midpoint; and female principals make the lowest scores. The implications of this pattern are clear. Male teachers are consistently most favorable toward collective action, female principals are consistently most unfavorable, while male principals and female teachers are undecided or uncommitted on the issue. This scoring pattern reinforces the contention that male teachers are most likely to furnish leadership for the collective action movement in education, while female teachers will tend to assume the role of passive followers. Of significance is the fact that female teachers and male principals, who constitute a majority of the N. C. sample and of the education profession, hold similar uncommitted attitudes toward the collective action process. If the sample is representative of overall attitudes, it can be assumed that educators are, by and large, rather homogeneous in their thinking concerning teacher militance, or collective negotiations. One can, consequently, expect a somewhat bland, "middle-of-the-road" point of view to prevail among a majority of school personnel.

---

[14] Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966), p. 183.

The results of the hypotheses generating study indicate that most of the total variance in response to the scales is accounted for by the sex and organizational position variables. Length of residence has little effect on attitudes toward collective action, probably as a result of the fact that most North Carolina educators were trained in state institutions and have pursued their entire teaching careers within the state. Education level and certification level do not significantly affect educator attitudes toward collective action, a somewhat surprising finding. It had been expected that increased training would increase general receptiveness to militant collective action. The reasons for this finding are not clear.

Type of school unit (city-county) and size of city of residence have little effect upon respondent scores. It had been thought that large city educators would respond differently than those from small cities or from rural areas, since labor-oriented activities such as collective action generally find a more favorable reception in the larger population centers. Also, it was thought that the presence of more highly organized and activist teacher groups in large cities would promote responses more favorable to collective action than would be found in small cities or rural areas. The non-appearance of significant differences may be a function of the rural homogeneity of the state in general. That is, responses may be influenced by the fact that urban-rural crystallization has not occurred to any great extent in North Carolina.

The fact that significant attitudinal variations based on level of experience did not appear indicates that, insofar as attitudes toward collective action are concerned, experience causes little, if any, difference in the reactions of public school personnel. It had been posited that political attitudes and attitudes toward collective action are somewhat related. However, the data do not support this contention, since, as Zeigler found, political conservatism tends to vary directly with length of teaching experience.[15]

No significant differences based on level of employment appeared. It had seemed logical that secondary teachers would score significantly higher than elementary teachers on the Colletive Action Scales, since males are in a majority in the secondary schools. The mean scores of male and female secondary teachers were slightly higher than those of male and female elementary teachers, but not significantly so.

From these findings it becomes apparent that there is considerable homogeneity of attitude among sample respondents. The analyses employed, based on the use of variables having logical validity, seem to indicate that most of the response variance present is accounted for by the sex and organizational position of the respondents. These findings represent a small piece in the complex behavioral pattern constituting teacher-administrator-board relations. Considerably more empirical validation will be necessary before the parameters of this process can be delineated with any degree of certainty.

It appears that Olson's comment at the beginning of this chapter is quite apropos to the findings of the study. While there is little doubt that North Carolina teachers qualify as both "rational and self interested individuals" and that they would benefit if they employed collective negotiations as a matter of course; thus far, the teachers of North Carolina have not only eschewed overt collective militancy but have, by and large, rejected the thinking which fosters such activity. How long it will be before this general attitudinal predisposition changes, or indeed whether it will ever change is moot.

---

[15] Harmon Zeigler, The Political World of the High School Teacher (Eugene:Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1966), p. 9.

Correlations Between Dewey Progressivism and Collective Action

As pointed out in Chapter IV, collective action was thought to be related to progressive educational thought due to the former's liberal social characteristics. These characteristics include a basic commitment to change in public education, and a disregard for traditional bureaucratic patterns in favor of the needs of the individual professional. However, the results of the analyses lend only qualified support to this prediction. All correlations, including those which are significant, are marginal in size, a fact which renders their validity dubious. Interpretations are, therefore, qualified by the adjuration caveat emptor.

Some degree of positive relationship appears to exist between the construct collective negotiations and progressivism-traditionalism. Thus, respondents who favor the collective negotiations process also expouse Dewey progressivism. Those who are opposed to collective negotiations are more inclined toward uncommittedness or toward historical traditionalism in their educational philosophies. Carried to its logical extreme, the presence of a high score on one scale would be predictive of scores on the other. However, the low correlation obtained makes interpretations arrived at in this manner at best equivocal. It is probably more defensible to indicate simply that there is apparent a slight positive correlation between the two constructs, and that it would be interesting to perform additional research designed to reinforce or to disprove the validity of the finding.

The data indicate that the sample's attitudes toward the constructs "sanctions" and strike and toward Dewey progressivism-traditionalism are independent. That is, a respondent's scores on the "sanctions" and strike scales in no way influence his score on the progressivism-traditionalism scale. Thus, the contention that attitudes toward "sanctions" and strikes are somehow related to progressive-traditional educational attitudes, is rejected, subject to further empirical testing. It is hoped that additional research along this line can be undertaken within a reasonable period of time.

CHAPTER VI

RATIONALE FOR UTILIZATION OF KERLINGER'S EDUCATION SCALE I - AB

Early in the twentieth century John Dewey delineated a number of important philosophical points on education.[1] Part of his work deals with approaches to the education of the young which have since been called the progressive v. traditional schools of educational thought. While these terms have been bandied about for over fifty years, little had been done prior to 1950 to operationally describe and quantify these concepts at the empirical level.

In the early 1950's, Kerlinger undertook the development of a scale designed to measure "permissive-progressive" and "restrictive-traditional" dimensions of educational attitudes.[2] It was his belief that these attitudinal dimensions are "real" and that quantification of these constructs would serve a useful purpose in education. Kerlinger defines "restrictiveness" (traditionalism) as

> ...a generally narrow and practical (in a limiting sense) educational viewpoint. Emphasis is on subject matter for its own sake, impersonal superior-inferior relationships with considerable importance attached to the hierarchical nature of such relationships, external discipline, and conservative status quo preserving social beliefs.

---

[1] John Dewey, The Child and the Curriculum (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902), passim.

[2] Fred N. Kerlinger, "The Attitude Structure of the Individual: A Q-Study of the Educational Attitudes of Professors and Laymen," Genetic Psychological Monographs LIII (1956), pp. 283-329.

> 'Morality' is strongly emphasized and based on external 'higher' authority.[3]

This crystallized and rather dogmatic view of education is contrasted with "permissiveness" (progressivism), which is characterized

> ...by emphasis on problem-solving and relative de-emphasis on subject matter and knowledge, education as growth, children's interests and needs as basic to education, equality and warmth in interpersonal relationships, internal discipline, liberal social beliefs which emphasize education as an instrument of social change, and a morality based on social and individual responsibility.[4]

Kerlinger hoped to determine whether such creatures as "traditionalists" and "progressives" exist, and whether traditionalism and progressivism are correlated or independent in nature. He was further concerned with the possible bipolarity of the dimension or dimensions involved in this construct. Kerlinger, throughout his work, has been concerned with adequate definition of the dimensions involved in his scales. He rightly criticizes the overemphasis of researchers on a priori methods of logical validation in scale construction, indicating that while judgmental verdicts may produce excellent predictive validity, such techniques cast little light upon the "reality" of the variables in question.

In order to build a strong case for the logical validity of his scale, Kerlinger utilized Q methodology and Thurstone centroid factor analysis to determine the dimensions involved, defining factors in terms of high loadings obtained.[5] This procedure yielded two attitudinal dimensions, factors A and B, which in content corresponded to the progressivism and traditionalism viewpoints previously described. Following the initial isolation of basic factors, Kerlinger developed two ten-item sub-scales which became known as Education Scale I, A and B. Kerlinger states that the ten items in each of the sub-scales are highly saturated on the factor with which they are associated and points out that

---

[3] F. N. Kerlinger, "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes," The Journal of Social Psychology, XLVIII (1958), pp. 111-135.

[4] Ibid.

> a person who is strongly progressive should... put high values on A or "progressive" items and a strong traditionalist should similarly put high values in B items.[6] (sic)

Factor analysis yielded three factors,[7] two of which (A and B) appropriate most of the common factor variance in the predicted manner. The R matrix indicates a positive and generally significant intercorrelation of A items.[8] Their range is from .058 to .340. B items intercorrelate positively, also, their range being from .087 to .463. Correlations between A and B items ranged from -.003 to -.410, the mean being -.111. Examination of the V matrix indicates that the A factor displays bipolar tendencies, as does the B factor, to a lesser extent. Seven of the ten A items correlate negatively and significantly with the B items, while five of the B items intercorrelate negatively and significantly with the A items. Table XII shows the correlations of all A items with total B scores as significant and negative, while all B items correlate significantly and negatively with A total scores,[9] albeit at a low level.

---

[5] F. N. Kerlinger, "The Attitude Structure of the Individual: A Q Study of the Educational Attitudes of Professors and Laymen," Genetic Psychological Monographs, LIII (1956), pp. 283-329.

[6] F. N. Kerlinger, "Manual for Education Scale I and Education Scale II," New York University, no date, (mimeographed), p. 2.

[7] Unrotated and rotated factor matrices and item total correlations for ES-I are reproduced in Appendix F.

[8] r's of .08 and .11 are significant at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.

Kerlinger argues that the relatively low level of correlation indicates the presence of two orthogonal factors, A and B. He indicates that total lack of correlation between A and B would be the most desirable circumstance since this would be an indication of the distinct and separate identity of the factors.

Kerlinger puts great stress on the "relative independence" of factors A and B. Concerning the orthogonality of the factors, he states that

> To put it briefly and crudely, A might be a dog and B a chicken. But the educational literature has usually implied the latter: that if a man is a traditionalist, then he must be an anti-progressive, and vice-versa. While some of the data of these studies indicate that this view is partly true, the more important fact is that progressivism and traditionalism seem to be separate and distinct psychological-sociological educational entities.[10]

---

[9] Correlations of .08 and .12 are significant at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.

[10] F. N. Kerlinger, "Progressivism and Traditionalism Basic Educational Attitudes," The School Review, (Spring, 1958), pp. 86-87.

TABLE XII

Factor Arrays for A & B Items*

A Items	Item-Total r's**		Factor Loadings	
	A	B	A	B
1. The goals of education should be dictated by children's interests and needs, as well as by the larger demands of society.	.44	-.09	.44	.01
2. No subject is more important than the personalities of the pupils.	.48	-.21	.39	-.14
5. Teachers, like university professors, should have academic freedom--freedom to teach what they think is right and best.	.57	-.23	.42	-.13
7. Teachers should encourage pupils to study and criticize our own and other economic systems and practices.	.49	-.22	.36	-.14
8. The traditional moral standards of our culture should not just be accepted; they should be examined and tested in solving the present problems of students.	.53	-.12	.45	.01
9. Learning is experimental; the child should be taught to test alternatives before accepting them.	.59	-.17	.51	-.05
15. Education and educational institutions must be sources of new social ideas; education must be a social program undergoing continual reconstruction.	.60	-.16	.55	-.03
16. Right from the very first grade, teachers must teach the child at his own level and not at the level of the grade he is in.	.47	-.17	.37	-.09
17. Children should be allowed more freedom than they usually get in the execution of learning activities.	.63	-.36	.58	-.26
20. In a democracy, teachers should help students understand not only the meaning of democracy but also the meaning of the ideologies of other political systems.	.42	-.13	.35	-.03

Table XII (Con't)

B Items	Item-Total r's** A	Item-Total r's** B	Factor Loadings A	Factor Loadings B
3. Schools of today are neglecting the three R's.	-.32	.47	-.38	.35
4. The pupil-teacher relationship is the relationship between a child who needs direction, guidance, and control and a teacher who is an expert supplying direction, guidance, and control.	-.18	.50	-.10	.38
6. The backbone of the school curriculum is subject matter; activities are useful mainly to facilitate the learning of subject matter.	-.09	.56	-.05	.52
10. The curriculum consists of subject matter to be learned and skills to be acquired.	-.21	.55	-.09	.50
11. The true view of education is so arranging learning that the child gradually builds up a storehouse of knowledge that he can use in the future.	-.13	.61	-.02	.58
12. One of the big difficulties with modern schools is that discipline is often sacrificed to the interests of the children.	-.32	.62	-.31	.54
13. The curriculum should contain an orderly arrangement of subjects that represent the best of our cultural heritage.	-.23	.54	-.11	.48
14. Discipline should be governed by long-range interests and well established standards.	-.13	.46	-.01	.41
18. Children need and should have more supervision and discipline than they usually get.	-.34	.61	-.33	.52
19. Learning is essentially a process of increasing one's store of information about the various fields of knowledge.	-.22	.68	-.10	.64

* This table modified from F. N. Kerlinger, "The Construction and Factor Analytic Validation of Scales to Measure Attitudes Toward Education," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIX (1959), pp. 24-25.

**The item-total correlations are product-moment r's. For example, .44 indicates the correlation of Item 1 on ES-I with the A total; -.09 indicates the correlation of Item 1 on ES-I with the B total.

Despite Kerlinger's somewhat qualified arguments, that "two relatively uncorrelated factors...underlie educational attitudes, and these two factors closely (resemble) Dewey's descriptions of progressivism and traditionalism"[11] the fact remains that bipolarity does occur in both the A and B factors, a point which should not be discounted lightly. Bipolarity suggests that progressivism and traditionalism may, after all, be the opposite ends of a continuum measuring educational attitudes.

Kerlinger also introduces a third score, the A-B or difference score, which purports to measure both "consistency of educational attitude" and "if positive, degree of progressivism and, if negative, degree of traditionalism."[12] With regard to performance consistency, Kerlinger's feeling is that the A-B score tends to be more reliable than the A or B scores due to the fact that there is a "social desirability phenomenon" in connection with the ES-I scale. He states:

> ...A items tend to be agreed with because several of them sound like the 'right' beliefs to hold... A-B scores, then, perhaps tend to get away from this blanket acceptance tendency.[13]

Kerlinger's utilization of the score in previous studies for purposes of determining "consistency of educational attitude" has shown it to be a better index of attitudes than either the A or B scores administered separately. More important to this study is the statement that the A-B score measures "degree of progressivism" and "degree of traditionalism." Kerlinger indicates that a person scoring "-.50 or greater" on A-B is likely to be traditional. By the same token, those persons scoring in a highly positive direction on A-B are likely to be progressive.

---

[11] F. N. Kerlinger, "The First and Second-Order Factor Structures of Attitudes Toward Education." (Soon to appear in The American Educational Research Journal).

[12] F. N. Kerlinger, "Manual for Education Scale I and Education Scale II," New York University, (no date), mimeographed, pp. 4-5.

[13] Ibid.

The general framework of this study revolves around the concept of placing respondents on a continuum ranging from a generally progressive orientation to a generally traditional position, with persons scoring around the midpoint of the continuum being relatively uncommitted. Consequently, the most meaningful way to approach the analysis was through the establishment of a typology based upon the respondent's general philosophical stance toward education. The A-B or "difference" score provides the analytical basis for this typology.

The Typology

Based on Kerlinger's statement that "...A-B scores measure, if positive, degree of progressivism and if negative, degree of traditionalism..."[14] a tri-partite classification was developed, which includes the following types: Progressive, uncommitted, traditional. Assignment to these types was based on the A-B score of the respondent. It was determined that the mean A-B score of the sample group was approximately +5, and that the standard deviation was 9. In the belief that analysis of differences based on the extreme groups would be the most meaningful approach to the problem since these groups would be most likely to "do something" about their beliefs through some form of social action, it was decided to establish an "uncommitted" category based on ±1 standard deviation from the mean of 5. Thus, the three categories are as follows: Progressive - A-B score of +15 or greater; Uncommitted - A-B score between +14 and -4; Traditional - A-B score of -4 or less. The broad band of uncommittedness removes from consideration those educators who are not strongly oriented either toward the Dewey school of progressive thinking or to the "basic education" traditional school of thought. A majority of the respondents fall in the uncommitted category due to this stringent selection procedure.

---

[14] *Ibid.*

The rationale for this typology is based on the assumption that a respondent scoring high on A-B has more "A-ness," (is more progressive); that one scoring close to zero is not highly loaded on either factor; and that a respondent scoring in a highly negative direction has more "B-ness" (is traditional). This trichotomized continuum has considerable logical validity and provides a ready means of classifying respondents.

It can be readily seen that, because the A-B score depends upon two scores for determination of the respondent's attitudinal position it is less subject to score distortion, purposeful or otherwise. It appears that this relatively unusual approach to the measurement of progressivism-traditionalism can serve as a useful method of attitude measurement. While different from the approach originally posited by Kerlinger, it has its basis in his writings, and demonstrates a convincing degree of logical validity.

Such a typology is also amenable to ready comparison with Collective Action Scales I, II, and III by means of Pearson Correlations. The statistic employed in analysis of the trichotomized progressivism-traditionalism data is x^2. The hypotheses involved in the analysis are stated in the null form. Additional questions of interest are also analyzed in a hypotheses generating exercise. The hypotheses and questions of interest are treated more fully in Chapter 7.

CHAPTER VII

ANALYSIS OF THE ES-I-AB DATA - THE PROGRESSIVISM-TRADITIONALISM SCALE

> "Many years ago John Dewey described the basic characteristics of progressivism and traditionalism in an admirably clear fashion. Many other thinkers and writers have also discussed the problem. The "reality" of the two dimensions, however, has rarely if ever, been questioned, more important, practically no research on the dimensions exists. We now feel fairly confident in saying that the dimensions do exist...in much the way Dewey described them."[1]

As discussed in the previous chapter, the analyses herein reported are founded on Kerlinger's basic work in the measurement of progressivism-traditionalism. The A-B Score, or difference score, is employed on the assumption that attitudes of this type can be placed on a continuum running from extreme progressivism to extreme traditionalism. This score has been shown to be more reliable and, perhaps, more valid than either the A (Progressivism) or B (Traditionalism) scores utilized separately.

Hypotheses Utilized

North Carolina's teaching force is a product of its environment. The state, one of the northernmost tier of so-called "deep south" states, is relatively non-industrialized at this time (1967), although light industry is currently making some inroads. As a result, the orientation of the state is rural and relatively conservative, politically and educationally speaking. There is a strong liberal wing within the Democratic Party. This liberal wing, whose champion is ex-governor Terry Sanford, has consistently given strong support to innovative programs in education. However, the fact remains that the general orientation of the populace is directed toward "fundamental principles" of education.

---

[1] Fred N. Kerlinger, "The Predictive Validity of Scales Constructed to Measure Attitudes Toward Education," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIX (1959), p. 316.

Most North Carolina teachers are trained in state institutions. The major teacher training institutions are the University of North Carolina, with its four branches; Carolina College; and Appalachian State Teachers College. The graduates of these institutions generally pursue their entire teaching careers within the environs of the state. For this reason, it was felt likely that the educational outlook of North Carolina teachers would be relatively homologous in nature.

Another factor contributing to the hypothesized attitudinal homogeneity is the lack of urban culture within the state. With the exception of Charlotte, there are no North Carolina cities in the 500,000 and larger category. This was seen both as preventing urban-rural attitudinal stratification and as contributing to attitudinal homotaxis among educators. As a result, the researcher hypothesized that the North Carolina educators sampled are relatively homogeneous in educational philosophy. The null hypothesis has been utilized in subsequent analyses. At the conceptual level, it has been hypothesized that sex and position differences among sampled North Carolina educators do not occur in matters of progressivism-traditionalism. The operational hypotheses employed follow:

1. There is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and principals sampled to items dealing with progressivism-traditionalism in education.

2. There is no significant difference in the responses of the male and female educators sampled to items dealing with progressivism-traditionalism in education.

Additionally, several other questions of interest have been included in an attempt at hypothesis-generation. These are as follows:

1. What effect does the number of years of state residency have upon the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of sampled educators?

2. What effect does level of educational training have upon the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of sampled educators?

3. What effect does the type of school unit in which employed (city v. county) have upon the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of sampled educators?

4. What effect does size of the town of residency have upon the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of sampled educators?

5. What effect does years of teaching experience have upon the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of sampled educators?

6. What effect does the level at which employed (elementary v. secondary) have upon the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of sampled educators?

7. What effect does certification level have upon the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of sampled educators?

The analyses have been made through use of the chi square (x^2) statistic. Directional interpretations which are not, of course, furnished by the statistic, are based on percentages computed on cell frequencies and should not be thought of as being the result of tests of significance. The various analyses are included as Tables XIII and XIV.

Analysis of the Data

The analysis performed through use of 3 x 2 contingency tables and the chi square (x^2) statistic indicate that rejection of the two major null hypotheses posited above is justified. It has been shown that organizational position (i.e., whether one is a teacher or a principal) significantly affects the attitude of the sample toward progressivism-traditionalism. (Table XIII)

TABLE XIII

x^2 and Percentage Analysis of A-B Scores
Total Groups Included

	Prog.*	Unc.	Trad.	
Teachers	58 (11%)	395 (75%)	72 (14%)	525
Principals	72 (20%)	266 (73%)	25 (7%)	363
	130	661	97	888

$x^2 = 20.6$
$p = .01$

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Males	94 (18%)	387 (72%)	50 (10%)	531
Females	36 (10%)	274 (77%)	47 (13%)	357
	130	661	97	888

$x^2 = 11.64$
$p = .01$

---

* The abbreviations are as follows: Prog. = progressive; Unc. = uncommitted; Trad. = traditional.

Examination of the frequencies of the extreme or committed groups, that is the progressive and traditional groups, on a percentage basis indicates that principals are about twice as likely to be progressive as are teachers, while teachers are twice as likely to be traditional as are principals. Within the extreme or committed groups, principals are almost three times as likely to be progressive as they are to be traditional, while teachers are slightly more likely to be traditional than progressive.

It has also been shown that sex of respondents significantly affects the attitudes of the sample toward progressivism-traditionalism. On a percentage basis, about twice as many males in the committed groups are progressive as are females, and fewer males are traditional than females. The results also indicate that, while almost twice as many males are progressive as are traditional, more females are traditional than progressive.

With regard to the hypotheses-generating questions, the following analytical results were obtained:

1. Length of residence does not significantly affect the performance of the sample on the progressivism-traditionalism scale. (Table XIV)

2. Level of educational training is significantly related to the performance of female teachers on the progressivism-traditionalism scale, but not to that of the other subsets. Female teachers with the Bachelors degree are three times as likely to be traditional as they are to be progressive. Slightly more of those holding the Masters degree or better are traditional than are progressive. Female teachers with the Masters degree are over twice as likely to be progressive as those holding the Bachelors degree.

3. Type of school unit is significantly related to the performance of the sample's female teachers on the progressivism-traditionalism scale, but not to that of the other subsets. (Table XIV) Female teachers from the

TABLE XIV

x^2 Analysis of A-B Scores

A. Based on subsets and length of residence in North Carolina

Male teachers

	Prog.*	Unc.	Trad.	
<10 yrs.	4	22	2	28
>10 yrs.	34	160	27	221
	38	182	29	249

$x^2 \equiv 3.63$

p = n.s.**

Female teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
<10 yrs	4	18	4	26
>10 yrs	14	190	37	241
	18	208	41	267

$x^2 = 4.03$

p = n.s.

Male principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
<10 yrs.	2	7	0	9
>10 yrs.	52	193	20	265
	54	200	20	274

$x^2 = 1.85$

p = n.s.

Female principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
<10 yrs	0	2	0	2
>10 yrs	18	59	5	82
	18	61	5	84

$x^2 = .77$

p = n.s.

---

* The abbreviations are as follows: Prog. = progressive; Unc. = uncommitted; Trad. = traditional.

** Non-significant

TABLE XIV (Con't)

B. Based on Subsets and educational training

Male teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Bachelors	22	115	19	156
Masters+*	17	67	11	95
	39	182	30	251

$x^2 = 1.61$

p = n.s.

Female teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Bachelor	(5%) 11	(80%) 170	(15%) 31	212
Master+	(13%) 7	(70%) 38	(17%) 9	54
	18	208	40	266

$x^2 = 7.09$

$p = .05$

Male principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Bachelors	4	19	1	24
Masters+	50	183	19	252
	54	202	20	276

$x^2 = .95$

p = n.s.

Female principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Bachelor	1	15	2	18
Masters+	16	45	3	64
	17	60	5	82

$x^2 = 4.83$

p = n.s.

---

*The Masters+ category includes those respondents holding the Masters degree and those having completed work beyond the Masters.

Table XIV (Con't)

C. Based on subsets and type of school unit*

Male teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
City	19	59	9	87
County	21	121	21	163
	40	180	30	250

$x^2 = 5.07$

p = n.s.

Female teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
City	(8%) 9	(80%) 88	(12%) 12	109
County	(5%) 8	(76%) 121	(19%) 29	158
	17	209	41	267

$x^2 = 8.30$

p = .05

Male principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
City	17	60	7	84
County	36	137	13	186
	53	197	20	270

$x^2 = .98$

p = n.s.

Female principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
City	12	32	2	46
County	6	26	2	34
	18	58	4	80

$x^2 = 4.32$

p = n.s.

---

* At the time of this study North Carolina had 100 county units and 69 city units.

Table XIV (Con't)

D. Based on subsets and size of city of residence

Male teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤10,000	(13%) 19	(75%) 113	(12%) 18	150
>10,000	(18%) 18	(69%) 68	(13%) 12	98
	37	181	30	248

$x^2 = 7.25$

$p = .05$

Female teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤10,000	(4%) 6	(80%) 113	(16%) 22	141
>10,000	(10%) 12	(77%) 91	(13%) 15	118
	18	204	37	259

$x^2 = 10.80$

$p = .01$

Male principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤10,000	31	131	10	172
>10,000	23	69	9	101
	54	200	19	273

$x^2 = 4.69$

$p =$ n.s.

Female principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤10,000	4	27	2	33
>10,000	14	32	3	49
	18	59	5	82

$x^2 = 4.00$

$p =$ n.s.

Table XIV (Con't)

E. Based on subsets and length of experience

Male teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤15 yrs.	(15%) 29	(75%) 144	(10%) 19	192
>15 yrs.	(15%) 9	(67%) 40	(18%) 11	60
	38	184	30	252

$x^2 = 8.69$

$p = .05$

Female teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤15 yr	10	132	24	166
>15 yr	8	79	18	105
	18	211	42	271

$x^2 = .70$

p = n.s.

Male principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤15 yrs.	28	80	5	113
>15 yrs.	26	122	15	163
	54	202	20	276

$x^2 = 5.29$

p = n.s.

Female principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
≤15 yr	1	4	1	6
>15 yr	17	57	4	78
	18	61	5	84

$x^2 = 1.35$

p = n.s.

Table XIV (Con't)

F. Based on subsets and level of employment*

Male teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Elem.	8	28	4	40
Sec.	31	152	26	209
	39	180	30	249

$x^2 = 1.47$

p = n.s.

Female teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Elem.	8	133	23	164
Sec.	9	74	18	101
	17	207	41	265

$x^2 = 3.64$

p = n.s.

Male principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Elem.	(23%) 36	(72%) 111	(5%) 8	155
Sec.	(15%) 18	(76%) 89	(9%) 9	116
	54	200	17	271

$x^2 = 20.07$

p = .01

Female principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
Elem.	18	56	5	79
Sec.	0	5	0	5
	18	61	5	84

$x^2 = 2.00$

p = n.s.

---

* For purposes of analysis, secondary level includes grades 7-12.

Table XIV (Con't)

G. Based on subsets and certification level*

Male teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
A	25	120	20	165
G	14	64	10	88
	39	184	30	253

$x^2 = 5.42$

p = n.s.

Female teachers

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
A	(5%) 11	(78%) 170	(17%) 36	217
G	(14%) 7	(72%) 35	(14%) 6	48
	18	205	42	265

$x^2 = 7.67$

p = .05

Male principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
A	6	32	4	42
G	48	169	15	232
	54	201	19	274

$x^2 = 4.74$

p = n.s.

Female principals

	Prog.	Unc.	Trad.	
A	1	18	2	21
G	17	43	3	63
	18	61	5	84

$x^2 = 4.90$

p = n.s.

---

* In North Carolina beginning teachers are granted "A" certification on the basis of a Bachelors degree and no experience. After gaining three years of teaching experience and earning the masters degree, teachers are eligible for "G" certification.

city are somewhat more likely to be traditional as they are to be progressive. Female teachers from the country are over three times as likely to be traditional as they are to be progressive. Female teachers from the country are more traditional and less progressive in position than those from the city.

4. Size of the city of residence is significantly related to the performance of the sample's male and female teacher on the progressivism-traditionalism scale, but not to that of the other subsets. (Table XIV)

Within the committed groups, male teachers from cities of more than 10,000 population are more likely to be progressive than those from cities having 10,000 or fewer residents. Also, male teachers from cities over 10,000 population are more likely to be progressive than they are to be traditional, while those from cities having 10,000 or fewer residents are no more likely to fall in one category than the other.

Within the committed groups, female teachers from cities of population 10,000 or less are more likely to be traditional than those from cities of over 10,000. Four times as many females from cities of 10,000 or less population are traditional as are progressive. Slightly more female teachers from cities of 10,000 or over are traditional than are progressive, but female teachers from cities of over 10,000 are more than twice as likely to be progressive as female teachers from cities of 10,000 or less.

5. Length of teaching experience is significantly related to the progressivism-traditionalism scale scores of male teachers but not to those of the other subsets. (Table XIV)

Within the committed groups, male teachers with 15 years or less experience are more likely to be progressive than they are to be traditional, while those with over 15 years experience are more likely to be traditional than they are to be progressive. Traditionalism increases sharply with experience, while progressivism remains constant.

6. Level of employment (i.e., elementary-secondary) is significantly related to the progressivism-traditionalism scale scores of male principals, but not to those of the other subsets. (Table XIV)

Within the committed groups, both elementary and secondary male principals are more likely to be progressive than traditional. Male elementary principals are more likely to be progressive than are male secondary principals.

7. Certification level is significantly related to the progressivism-traditionalism scale scores of female teachers but not to those of the other subsets. (Table XIV)

Within the committed groups, female teachers with initial or "A" certification[2] are more likely to be traditional than progressive, while those with graduate or "G" certification are equally likely to be traditional or progressive. Female teachers holding the "G" certificate are over twice as likely to be progressive as those holding the "A" certificate. These findings are, of course, closely related to those obtained on the basis of level of educational training, since graduate training is one of the prerequisites for "G" certification. Interestingly, experience, the other prerequisite for "G" certification, does not appear to affect the progressivism-traditionalism positions of female teachers. This may be because the "cut-off" point for the experience factor is such that differences are "masked" in the data.

---

[2] In North Carolina "A" certification is granted to beginning teachers who hold the B.S. and who have no teaching experience. After 3 years experience and the attaining of the M.S., teachers are eligible for graduate, or "G" certification.

The implications of these findings are discussed more fully in Chapter VIII, "Discussion of the Findings obtained through use of Kerlinger's A-B Scale."

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS OBTAINED THROUGH USE OF KERLINGER'S A-B SCALE

> "Profound differences in theory are never gratuitous or invented. They grow out of conflicting elements in a genuine problem--a problem which is genuine just because the elements, taken as they stand, are conflicting."[1]

When Dewey made the above statement in 1902, the educational world was in the throes of philosophical dispute involving those who were proponents of the "subject-matter" approach to learning and those who espoused the "child-centered" approach in education.

Dewey dichotomizes these schools of thought, yet recognizes a basic unity in the two approaches. He argues that the child's life is not logically classified into neatly pigeon-holed curricular divisions, but is a fluid, transitional existence highly dependent on affection and sympathy for its balance. The curriculum, on the other hand, categorizes the world on a logical and scientific basis, one designed to foster rationality of behavior--and one which is alien to the child, at least initially. While the espouser of the traditional "subject matter" approach presses for an orderly presentation of the world based on eternal and general truths, his opposite number recognizes the child is the starting point, the center and end of education. As Dewey says:

---

[1] John Dewey, The Child and the Curriculum. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902), p. 7.

> "His development, his growth, is the ideal. It alone furnishes the standard. To the growth of the child all studies are subservient. Not knowledge or information, but self-realization is the goal."[2]

Dewey is quick to indicate that the reasonable person recoils from the extreme positions posited above, tending rather to assume a compromising posture of often inconsistent characteristics. He counsels educators to recognize that children's experience contains elements conducive to the development of a grasp of subject-matter as well as other qualities of a nature less easily regimented. He urges:

> "Abandon the notion of subject matter as something fixed and ready-made in itself outside the child's experience; cease thinking of the child's experience as also something hard and fast; see it as something fluent, embryonic, vital; and we realize that the child and the curriculum are simply two limits which define a single process. Just as two points define a straight line, so the present standard of the child and the facts...studies define instruction." (Emphasis added)[3]

It is clear that Dewey is referring to the two constructs which Kerlinger labels "progressivism" and "traditionalism." Kerlinger based his scale construction on statements gleaned from the writings of "child-centered" and "subject-matter centered" educators of that period.

---

[2] Dewey, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[3] Dewey, *op. cit.*, p. 16

However, it should be noted that, while Kerlinger argues that "progressivism" and "traditionalism" are relatively orthogonal factors, Dewey's arguments and, to an extent, Kerlinger's data, support the notion of a progressivism-traditionalism continuum. This idea of a continuum is the basis upon which the use of the A-B Score was predicated.

The prime purpose of this analysis is the determination of the philosophical orientation of a sample of North Carolina teachers. How do they perceive their instructional roles vis a vis progressivism-traditionalism? Are they generally extreme or do they utilize "common sense" which, as Dewey predicts, "tends to fluctuate ... back and forward in a maze of inconsistent compromise?"[4]

Questions as to how the orientations of teachers affect their actions and consequently the student, are beyond the scope of this investigation and can only be the subject of conjecture at this point.

Discussion of the findings

The analyses performed ultimated in rejection of the null hypothesis that position differences do not affect attitudes toward progressivism-traditionalism. It was shown that the sample teachers and principals do, in fact, entertain differential philosophical perceptions concerning the ends of education, these differences being primarily a matter of degree. Both teachers and principals in the sample believe that subject-matter is important, and also that the needs of the child must be served. The question is primarily one of emphasis. Examination of the committed groups shows that principals tend to place more emphasis on the "child," while teachers are more concerned about the "curriculum." Such emphases are quite understandable, given the nature of the duties each position entails. While the principal's view of education is primarily "global" in nature, oriented toward the overall needs of the student body and the educational program, the teaching staff tends to hold a "specific," or "inward-directed" view of the process, which emphasizes the importance of the particular subject or subjects being presented. While the role of the principal is to "provide leadership for the development and implementation of the instructional program at his school,"[5] an expansive concept, teachers normally concern themselves primarily with "getting the material across."

---

[4] Dewey, op. cit., p. 15.

The present research is supported by the work of Hulon,[6] and Wall,[7] both of whom reported that teachers are more conservative than administrators on some issues.

---

[5] Edgar L. Morphet, et. al., Educational Organization and Administration. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967, second edition), p. 346.

[6] Harold G. Hulon, "Liberal-Conservative Attitudes of Public School Personnel in North Carolina" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of North Carolina, 1963), pp. 156-157.

[7] Barthalomew D. Wall, "Some Attitudinal Differences Among Educational Specialists, Administrators and Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, LII (November, 1959), p. 117.

If the sample data holds for the educational population at large, the finding that principals are about twice as likely to be progressive as are teachers, and that teachers are twice as likely to be traditional as are principals, becomes significant. Under these circumstances it could be expected that a group of highly committed principals (a minority of 20 percent in the sample) are proponents of Dewey progressivism. It might be reasoned that this small group periodically attempts to exert influence over their generally less committed staffs and peers, 80 - 90 percent of whom are either philosophically uncommitted (willing to compromise) or traditional in stance. A much smaller group (approximately 7 percent of the sample) favors "historical" traditionalism and probably attempts to intensify the "subject-matter" orientation of the schools with which they are associated.

It is conceivable that the high progressivism scores made by some sample principals are a function of what Kerlinger calls "social desirability." He states:

> "...the social desirability phenomenon is so everpresent in education scales. In this case A items tend to be agreed with because several of them sound like the "right" beliefs to hold. For example, when discussing the needs of children, almost everyone will agree that we should provide for the children's needs. /¯Both the progressive and traditionalist...7 will tend to agree with attitude statements about children's needs simply because a denial of such needs is not fashionable, so to speak."[8]

---

[8] F. N. Kerlinger, "Manual for Education Scale I and Education Scale II," New York University, No Date. (Mimeographed), pp. 4-5.

There is, of course, no way of determining the genuineness of any subset's response to attitude scales through use of a single measuring device. Some degree of basic faith in the integrity of the individual must be in order.

The analyses showed that sex significantly affects the attitudes of the sample toward progressivism-traditionalism. While overall examination of the sample reveals a majority of both males and females to be uncommitted, falling toward the middle of the continuum, the presence of highly committed minorities at either end is considered significant. Percentage analysis of the committed groups reveals that about twice as many males are progressive as are females, while fewer males are traditional than females. Also, males are about twice as likely to be progressive as they are to be traditional while females are somewhat more likely to be traditional than progressive.

It can be predicted from the results that the majority of males and females practice "compromise" behavior in philosphical matters, while small committed groups favor Dewey progressivism or "historical traditionalism." The progressive group, seen as being most likely to press their ideology upon their colleagues, is likely to be composed of males. The traditional group is more likely to be composed of females. Zeigler's work on political conservatism (i.e., reaction to overt governmental activities), indicates that women are politically more conservative than men, a fact seen as supporting the findings of the present study, since, as Zeigler states:

> "One would expect, of course, that attitudes toward educational progressivism and the tendency to put faith in the school is related to attitudes toward the political world. Generally speaking, this is the case, educational progressivism is positively related to liberalism..."[9]

However, Zeigler's attempts to measure educational progressivism yielded a different result. He found women more progressive than men.

Studies on the liberal-conservative attitudes of males and females are numerous. Hulon found women more conservative than men on certain aspects of educational thinking[10] and Sullivan found women teachers to be generally more conservative than men teachers.[11] Both of these studies corroborate the findings of the present research.

---

[9] Harmon Zeigler, The Political World of the High School Teacher, (Eugene: Center For Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1966), p. 14.

[10] Harold G. Hulon, "Liberal-Conservative Attitudes of Public School Personnel in North Carolina (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1963), p. 172.

[11] John C. Sullivan, A Study of the Social Attitudes and Information on Public Problems of Women Teachers in Secondary Schools, Teachers College, Columbia University. Contributions to Education, No. 791 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949), p. 23.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that both Harper[12] and Tidrick[13] reported that sex could not be used reliably to predict conservatism. The reader should, in all fairness, examine the research of these various writers in order to determine which best satisfies his criteria for objective reality.

The results of this analysis indicate that the public schools, far from being "hotbeds" of Dewey progressivism, as has sometimes been charged, are staffed by personnel who are generally "middle-of-the-road" in philosophical commitment. Movements from this approach, either in the direction of progressive or traditional philosophies, are likely to be fostered by a relatively small percentage of committed individuals who must, perforce, convince the uncommitted majority to support them.

In an attempt to identify more clearly the influences operating on the attitudes of the sample, sex and position, as proven sources of variance, were held constant and other variables were introduced for analytical purposes. The analyses were conducted utilizing the extreme or committed groups within the sample, who were adjudged most likely to "do something" about their philosophical commitments.

---

[12] Manley H. Harper, Social Beliefs and Attitudes of American Educators, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927), p. 84.

[13] Lawrence J. Tidrick, "The Social Attitudes of Social Science Teachers," (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, New York University, 1936), p. 38.

Length of residence in North Carolina was introduced on the assumption that "outsiders" might differ in attitudes from long-time residents. The analysis indicated no significant differences in response. It should be pointed out that relatively few persons who are recent arrivals in the state are present in the sample. Only 10 percent of the teachers and 2 percent of the principals in the sample have lived in the state for less than ten years. It seems evident that such a situation is dangerously susceptible to "inbreeding" and lack of creativity. Although there is no hard data in this analysis to show that such a situation does, in fact, exist within the state, the danger of its occurrence is deemed sufficient cause for mentioning the matter.

Educational training is shown by the analysis to significantly affect the philosophical positions of the female teachers only. While increased education does double the percentage of female teachers who are progressive, BA and MA holders who are traditional are in the preponderance within the committed groups. More female Master's degree holders are conservative than female Bachelor's degree holders. It has been reasoned that education increases openness to progressive educational thought. While this was the case, the number of traditional female teachers was also increased by additional training.

An important question arises as to the reason that other subgroups are unaffected by educational level. The answer is not apparent from the data at hand. However, the presence of such a question is intriguing.

Type of school unit (i.e., city or county) is shown to affect the scores of female teachers, but not those of the other subsets. It had been suggested that county educators are less likely to be progressive due to their rural orientation. This thinking was supported by the data to the extent that county female teachers are shown to be more traditional and less progressive than those from the city. The other subsets were uncommitted, according to the data.

These findings are somewhat related to those concerning size of city of residence. It was shown by the analysis that the attitudes of male and female teachers are affected by city size, while those of the remaining subsets are unaffected. Within the committed groups, male teachers from towns of over 10,000 population are more likely to be progressive than their counterparts from towns of less than 10,000. Those from larger cities are more likely to be progressive than traditional, while male teachers from towns of less than 10,000 are equally as likely to be progressive as they are to be traditional.

Female teachers from cities of over 10,000 are more likely to be progressive than those from cities of 10,000 or less in size, a fact which corroborates the finding for male teachers. It can be seen that population concentration is related in some way to progressive educational thought. It could be argued that this progressivism is a function of better training on the part of large city teachers, who are often attracted by the superior salary schedules to be found there. No firm predictions to this effect can be made from the data, however.

It must be pointed out that, while large city female teachers are more progressive than those from smaller cities, both groups are, nevertheless, more likely to be traditional than they are to be progressive. This finding supports the findings for type of school unit, in which the same general situation prevailed.

It was found that length of teaching experience is significantly related to the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of male teachers, but not to those of the other subsets. Within the committed groups, less experienced male teachers are more likely to be progressive than traditional, while more experienced teachers are more likely to be traditional than progressive. The percentage of progressives remains constant over time, while the percentage of traditionals increases sharply. Apparently uncommitted male teachers grow more conservative as experience increases, while progressives maintain their commitment to progressivism.

This finding is supported by Zeigler's study. He indicates that "the general pattern is to shift toward conservatism as teaching experience increases."[14] Age and income are probably related to this finding, although the data offers no support for such an assertion.

Level of employment (i.e., elementary or secondary) is significantly related to the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of male principals, but not to those of the other subsets. Within the committed groups, both elementary and secondary male principals are more likely to be progressive than traditional. However, male elementary principals are more progressive than male secondary principals.

This is not an unreasonable finding considered in the light of Dewey's arguments concerning "Child vs. Curriculum." Elementary schools operate preponderantly in the self-contained classroom pattern, while secondary schools are generally departmentalized. Elementary education tends to emphasize serving the interests of the developing child, while secondary education gives considerably more attention to subject-matter. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect male elementary principals to espouse progressivism to a greater extent than male secondary principals. The fact that the attitudes of female principals are not affected is an artifact of the data; caused by the almost total absence of female secondary principals in North Carolina. No significant differences for the male and female teacher subsets were forthcoming, a somewhat surprising fact.

---

[14] Zeigler, _op_. _cit_., p. 9.

Certification level was shown to be significantly related to the progressivism-traditionalism attitudes of female teachers but not to those of the other subsets. Within the committed groups those female teachers with graduate certification, which is based on several years' experience and Masters level training, are more progressive than those with initial certification. Those with initial certification are more likely to be traditional than progressive, while those with graduate training are no more likely to be progressive than traditional. It had been projected that those educators holding G certificates would be more progressive than traditional. The fact that conservatism tends to increase with experience may be the key to this puzzle, the "conservative" experience factor offsetting the contribution to progressivism made by graduate training.

The findings indicate that the great majority of educators within the sample are uncommitted on questions of progressivism-traditionalism. That is to say, they tend to assume a "compromising" attitude, placing emphasis both upon subject matter and upon the needs and interests of children. The statement that "moderation in all things is desirable" seems to be the maxim observed by the majority of the North Carolina educators within the sample. If the data holds for the population of North Carolina educators, one can expect the average school person to be a "middle-of-the-roader" on questions of philosophical commitment, concerned about the students' psychological needs but determined to impart the knowledge necessary for successful citizenship.

Within the teaching group one can also expect to find small, relatively committed groups of progressives and traditionals, each group deviating from the usual philosophical pattern to some degree. These groups are seen as being most likely to take strong positions, possibly coupled with actions designed to promote the particular philosophy espoused. The dampening effects of majority peer pressures are seen as probably reducing the impact and intensity of such activities, however.

Thus, the schools are most likely to reflect a somewhat bland and unspectacular philosophy, one which is susceptible of ready compromise as the political need arises. Such a philosophy possibly is best suited to ensuring the survival of the North Carolina schools and their staffs, given the current climate of substantial and often conflicting outside pressures in which they are obliged to operate.

CHAPTER IX

THE VIEWS OF SOUTHERN TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

This chapter summarizes the findings of the analyses made utilizing the data collected through use of the collective negotiations, "sanctions" and strike scales and Kerlinger's Progressivism-traditionalism Scale (A-B). The reader is referred to the appropriate sections of the report for a more complete discussion of the findings, which follow:

1. The North Carolina teachers and principals sampled tend to be generally uncommitted in their attitudes toward collective negotiations and "sanctions." This finding is probably a result of their complete lack of experience with the collective negotiations and "sanctions" processes. Despite this result, significant differences in response based on sex and position were discovered within the sample.

2. The sample members tend to be generally negative in their attitudes toward the strike when employed in an educational context. This is probably the result of North Carolina's general "anti-union" orientation and of adherance to professional ideology, which stigmatizes the strike as an undesirable form of behavior for educators to espouse. Significant differences in response based on sex and position were found to be present.

3. Male educators in the North Carolina sample are more positive in attitude toward collective negotiations, "sanctions" and strikes than female educators. Males are seen as being most likely to furnish leadership to the collective action movement.

4. Teachers in the sample are more positive in their attitudes toward collective negotiations, "sanctions" and strikes than principals. This is seen as being the result of economic pressures felt by teachers, particularly male teachers, who see collective action as a means of enhancing their financial status. Also contributing to this situation is the principals' fear of loss of administrative discretion and the traditional prerogatives of management.

5. Length of residence in North Carolina has no significant effect on the attitudes of the sample toward collective negotiations, "sanctions" and strikes.

6. Level of educational training and level of certification do not significantly affect the attitudes of the sample toward collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes.

7. Type of school unit (city-county) and size of city of residence have no significant effect upon the attitudes of the sample toward collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes. This finding is probably influenced by the rural homogeneity of the population; that is, by the lack of urban-rural crystallization within the state.

8. Length of experience in professional education has no significant effect upon the attitudes of the sample toward collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes.

9. The level at which the sample members teach has no significant effect upon their attitudes toward collective negotiations, "sanctions," and strikes.

10. A degree of positive relationship apparently exists between the constructs collective negotiations and progressivism-traditionalism. Additional research is needed to reinforce or to disprove the validity of the finding.

11. The data indicate that Dewey progressivism-traditionalism, and the "sanctions" and strike constructs are independent, not related to one another.

12. A great majority of educators within the sample are uncommitted on questions of progressivism-traditionalism, which is to say that they assume a compromising attitude which emphasizes both "child" and "curriculum."

13. A minority of educators representing approximately 25% of the sample are committed either to the progressive or traditional schools of thought.

14. Within the committed groups, principals are about twice as likely to be progressive as are teachers, while teachers are about twice as likely to be traditional as are principals. Principals are, in a word, more progressive than teachers.

15. Within the committed groups male educators are about twice as likely to be progressive as female educators, and fewer males are traditional than females. Thus, males are, generally speaking, more progressive than females.

16. Length of residence in North Carolina was not shown to affect attitudes toward progressivism-traditionalism.

17. Within the committed groups, female teachers holding the masters degree are more progressive than those holding the bachelors degree, but the number of traditional female teachers is also increased by graduate training. Additional education reduces uncommittedness to some degree.

18. Female teachers from county school units are more traditional than those from city units. Both groups are more likely to be traditional than they are to be progressive.

19. Female teachers from cities of less than 10,000 population who are within the committed groups are more traditional than those from cities of over 10,000 population. Both groups are more likely to be traditional than they are to be progressive.

20. Within the committed groups male teachers from cities of over 10,000 population are more progressive than those from cities of 10,000 or less. This result and that in 8, above, indicate that population concentration is somehow related to incidence of progressive educational thought.

21. Within the committed groups less experienced male teachers are more likely to be progressive than traditional

and more experienced male teachers are likelier to be traditional than progressive.

22. The percentage of male teachers who are progressive remains constant as experience increases, while the number of male teachers who are traditional increases sharply with experience. The latter finding indicates that uncommittedness declines as experience increases.

23. Within the committed groups, male elementary principals are more progressive than male secondary principals. This may be a function of differences in the elementary and secondary school curricular structures.

24. Within the committed groups, female teachers with graduate certification are more progressive than those with initial certification.

The implications of these findings for the future of North Carolina education are plain. The findings may be of considerable value to educators in other states having ethnographic, cultural and educational configurations similar to North Carolina. No extravagant claims concerning the generalizability of the data are made, as the uniqueness of southern states and their educational patterns is well-known. Nevertheless, the information herein contained represents a contribution to the slow accumulation of empirical data on the collective action movement in public education.

The development of a viable theory of collective action is seen as being most susceptible to the inductive approach, which involves the slow accumulation of numerous specificities, each of which contributes to the theoretical whole. This approach is supported by Trow in the following statement:

> ...If the social sciences teach us anything... it is that the development of theory of various kinds is not simply the product of acts of will, but is the slow outcome of many efforts to describe, explain and account for specific social phenomena.[1]

Over time, this painful process will doubtless yield results sufficient to warrant the time expenditures of numerous empirical researchers. In the final analysis, it is upon the basic efforts of such as these that sound theory is constructed.

---

[1] Martin Trow, "Book Reviews," Administrative Science Quarterly, IV (1959-1960), 125.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Allen, Roy B., and John Schmid (ed.). *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration*. Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas, 1966.

Beal, Edwin F., and Edward D. Wickersham. *The Practice of Collective Bargaining*. Third edition. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1967.

Campbell, Roald, and others. *The Organization and Control of American Schools*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Company, 1965.

Carr-Saunders, A. M., and P. A. Wilson. *The Professions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Chamberlain, Neil W. *Sourcebook on Labor*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Corwin, Ronald G. *A Sociology of Education*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

Dewey, John. *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1902.

Educational Research and Development Council, *Teacher-Administrator-Board Relationships*. Minneapolis: Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Incorporated, 1967.

Edwards, Allen L. *Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Elsbree, Willard S. *The American Teacher*. New York: American Book Company, 1939.

Etzioni, Amitai. *Complex Organizations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Festinger, Leon. *Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Fruchter, Benjamin. *Introduction to Factor Analysis*. Princeton: D. van Nostrand Co., 1954.

Galbraith, John K. *American Capitalism*: The Concept of Countervailing Power. Revised edition. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1956.

Godine, M. R. *The Labor Problem in the Public Service.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Griffin, John I. *Strikes.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Guilford, J. P. *Fundamental Statistics in Psychological Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Harper, Manley H. *Social Beliefs and Attitudes of American Educators.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

Lane, Willard R., and others. *Foundations of Educational Administration.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967.

La Piere, R. T. *A Theory of Social Control.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Lieberman, Myron. *Education As A Profession.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

________., and Michael Moskow. *Collective Negotiations for Teachers.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

McNemar, Quinn. *Psychological-Statistics.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Miles, Matthew B. (ed.). *Innovation in Education.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Morphet, Edgar L., and others. *Educational Organization and Administration.* Second edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Murphy, Gardner and Rensis Likert. *Public Opinion and the Individual.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938.

Olson, Mancur, Jr. *The Logic of Collective Action.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Simmel, Georg. *Conflict.* Trans. by Kent H. Woeff. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Spero, Sterling D. *Government as Employer.* New York: Remsen Press, 1948.

Sullivan, John C. *A Study of the Social Attitudes and Information on Public Problems of Women Teachers in Secondary Schools.* Teachers College, Columbia University. Contributions to education, No. 791. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University, 1949.

Walton, Richard E., and Robert B. McKersie. *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Wert, James E., and others. *Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Ziegler, Harmon. *The Political World of the High School Teacher*. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1966.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of School Administrators. *Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent and Staff*. Washington: NEA, 1963.

Commission on Educational Reconstruction. *Organizing the Teaching Profession*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Committee on Professional Ethics. *Implementing the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession and Strengthening Professional Rights*. Washington: NEA, 1964.

Department of Classroom Teachers. *Classroom Teachers Speak on Professional Negotiations*. Washington: NEA, 1964.

______. *Classroom Teachers Speak on Professional Salary Schedules*. Washington: NEA, 1958.

______. *Survey Instrument on Conditions of Work for Quality Teaching*. Washington: NEA, (n.d.).

______. *The Local Association and Conditions of Work for Quality Teaching*. Washington: NEA, (n.d.).

Evans, John C., Jr. *Utah School Crisis - 1963*. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1963.

National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. *Guidelines for Professional Sanctions*. Washington: NEA, 1963.

National Education Association. *Addresses and Proceedings of the 103rd Annual Meeting*, Vol 103. Washington: NEA, 1965.

National Education Association. *Oklahoma: A Statewide Study of Conditions Detrimental to an Effective Educational Program*. Washington: NEA, 1965.

National Education Association. *Professional Negotiation with School Boards - A Legal Analysis and Review*. Washington: NEA, 1965.

National Education Association. *Utah: A Statewide Survey of School Conditions*. Washington: NEA, 1964.

Office of Professional Development and Welfare. *Guidelines for Professional Negotiation*. Washington: NEA, 1963.

______. *Professional Negotiation Conference Report*. Washington: NEA, 1964.

Salary Consultant Service. *Compendium of Level Three Professional Negotiation Agreements on File at the NEA*. Washington: NEA, 1964.

Seitz, Reynolds. "Legal Aspects of Collective Action by Public School Teachers," *National School Board Association Report*. April, 1964.

Solomon, P. *Professional Persons in Bureaucratic Organizations.* Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958.

Steffensen, James P. *Teachers Negotiate with Their School Boards*. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Bulletin No. 40. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Wollett, Donald H. "The Importance of State Legislation," *Professional Negotiation Conference Report*. Washington: NEA, 1964.

C. PERIODICALS

Aarlgard, R. "Ten Commandments for Teacher Negotiation," *School Activities*, XXXV (February, 1964), 174.

Becker, Harry A. "The Role of School Administrators in Professional Negotiation," *American School Board Journal*, CL (May, 1965), 9-10.

Betchkal, James (ed.). "Administrators Give Reluctant Approval to Sanctions - Condemn Strikes Three to One," The Nation's Schools, LXX (November, 1962), 71.

_______. "Administrators Say No Help Needed From Mediation Team for Teachers," The Nation's Schools, LXVIII (September, 1961), 63.

_______. "Role of New York Teachers in Forming School Policy Starts Controversy," The Nation's Schools, LXXII (November, 1963), 80.

_______. "The NEA and AFT Battle for Recognition," The Education Digest, XXX (November, 1964), 12-15.

_______. "The NEA and AFT Bicker and Battle for Recognition," The Nation's Schools, LXXIV (August, 1964), 35-41.

Boutwell, William D. "What's Happening in Education?" PTA Magazine, LVII (September, 1962), 25-26.

Brickman, William W. "Teachers' Right to Strike," School and Society, XCII (March, 1964), 93-94.

Briggs, Paul. "Professional Negotiations," Sixteenth Annual Report of Associated Public School Systems (1963-1964), pp. 25-26.

Brooks, George. "A Case for Teachers' Unions," Monthly Labor Review, LXXXVII (March, 1962), 292.

Bruce, William C. "An Illegal Strike," The American School Board Journal, CXLIV (June, 1962), 30.

Buder, Leonard. "The Teachers Revolt in New York City," Phi Delta Kappan, IXIII (June, 1962), 370-374.

Burns, Tom. "The Forms of Conduct." American Journal of Sociology. LXIV (September, 1958), 137-151.

Caliguri, J. "Do Associations and Unions Have the Same Gods?" The American School Board Journal, CXLVII (December, 1963), 9-10.

Carey, James B. "A Labor Leader Warns the NEA," American Teacher Magazine, XLVII (October, 1962), 11-12.

Carter, Barbara. "The Teachers Give Oklahoma a Lesson," The Reporter, September 9, 1965, pp. 34-36.

Chaffin, Lavor K. "Utah Teachers Prod Legislature with Threat of Boycott," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIV (May, 1963), 358-359.

Cherry, Howard L. "Negotiations Between Boards and Teacher Organizations," American School Board Journal, CXLVI (March, 1963), 7-9.

Clayton, A. S. "Professionalization and Problems of Power," Journal of Teacher-Education, XVI (March, 1965), 69-73.

Cline, Clarice, "The Professional Pattern in Teachers Organizations," Teachers College Record, LXII (October, 1961), 121-127.

Corey, Arthur F. "Strikes and Sanctions," NEA Journal, LI (October, 1962), 13-15.

______. "Why Sanctions Should Be Considered," The Nation's Schools, LXX (September, 1962), 69-72.

Counts, George S. "Socio-Economic Factors in Teacher Strikes," Phi Delta Kappan (April 1947), 350-352.

Dorros, Sidney. "The Case for Independent Professional Teachers' Associations," Monthly Labor Review, LXXXVII (May, 1964), 543.

Educational Policies Commission. "The Public Interest and How Teachers Organize," NEA Journal, LIII (September, 1964), 43-44.

Elam, Stanley (ed.). "Collective Bargaining and Strikes - or Professional Negotiation and Sanctions," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIV (October, 1962), 1-11.

______. "CTA Ends Little Lake Sanctions," Phi Delta Kappan, XLV (March, 1964), 277.

______. "Editorial Opinion on the Strike," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIII (June, 1962), 375.

______. "Of Strikes, Overkill, Boycotts and Billions," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIV (June, 1963), 397.

______. "PDK Opinions on Sanctions and Strikes," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIV (October, 1962), 9-11.

Epstein, Benjamin. "What Status and Voice for Principals and Administrators in Collective Bargaining and 'Professional Negotiation,' by Teachers Organizations," *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, XLIX (March, 1965), 226-258.

Evans, John C., Jr.,"Utah Teachers Pin Hope on New Strategy," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLVI (September, 1964), 16.

Exton, Elaine. "NSBA at the Crossroads," *The American School Board Journal*, CXLVII (December, 1963), 31-33.

———. "NSBA Opposes Teachers' Strikes and Sanctions," *The American School Board Journal*, CXLVI (June, 1963), 41-44.

———. "Pros and Cons of Sanctions Invoked by Utah's Public School Teachers," *The American School Board Journal*, CXLVII (July, 1963), 35-37.

———. "Teachers' Groups Challenge Lay School Board Control," *The American School Board Journal*, CXLVII (August, 1963), 28-29.

Fosdick, H. A. "Beefs From Time and Answers From the Unleashers," *The Nation's Schools*, LXX (October, 1962), 14-15.

Hipp, Frederick L. "Advancing the Welfare of Members," *NEA Journal*, LIII (January, 1964), 19-20.

Hubbard, Frank W. "Professional Associations - Change and Growth," *The National Elementary Principal*, XL (February, 1961), 16-20.

Jenkins, M. E. "American Teachers - Their Rights and Responsibilities," *PTA Magazine*, LVII (September, 1962), 2-3.

Kalkstein, Shawn. "Oklahoma's Education War," *Look*, XXX (January 25, 1966), 80-86.

Kennan, Richard. "Professional Sanctions," *The Education Digest*, XXIX (February, 1964), 30-31.

———. "Professional Sanctions - Where, When and How," *NEA Journal*, LII (December, 1963), 37-38.

———. "The North College Hill Case, *NEA Journal*, XXXVI (February, 1947), 432.

Kerlinger, F. N. "The Attitude Structure of the Individual: A Q-Study of the Educational Attitudes of Professors and Laymen." Genetic Psychology Monographs, LIII (1956), 283-329.

______. "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology XLVIII (1958), 111-135.

______. "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Educational Attitudes." The School Review. (Spring, 1958), 80-92.

______. "Factor Invariance in the Measurement of Attitudes toward Education." Educational and Psychological Measurement. XXI (1961), 273-285.

______., and Esin Kaya. "The Construction and Factor Analytic Validation of Scales to Measure Attitudes Toward Education," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIX (1959), 13-29.

______., and Esin Kaya. "The Predictive Validity of Scales Constructed to Measure Attitudes toward Education." Educational and Psychological Measurement. XIX (1959), 305-317.

Klein, Lawrence R. "The NEA Convention and Orgainzing the Teachers," Monthly Labor Review, LXXXVII (August, 1964), 822-887.

Lieberman, Myron. "Power and Policy in Education," Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University XL (September, 1964), 21-29.

______. "Some Reflections on Teachers Organizations," The Education Forum, XXIV (November, 1959), 74-76.

______. "Teachers on the March," The Nation, CC (February 1, 1965), 107-110.

______. "Teachers Strikes: An Analysis of the Issues," Harvard Educational Review, XXVI (Winter, 1956), 39-69.

______. "The Battle for New York City's Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIII (October, 1961), 2-8.

______. "Teacher Strikes - Acceptable Strategy?" Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (January, 1965), 237-240.

Lieberman, Myron. "Who Speaks for Teachers?" Saturday Review, XLVIII (June 19, 1965), 64-66.

McCann, Lloyd E. "The Right to Talk or the Right to be Heard," American School Board Journal, CXLVI (June, 1963), 11-12.

Megal, Carl J. "Teacher Conscription - Basis of Association Membership?" Teachers College Record, LXVI (October, 1964), 17-21.

______. "The Union Pattern of Teachers Organizations," Teachers College Record, LXIII (November, 1961), 115-120.

Moffitt, J. C. "Sanctions So What?" American School Board Journal, CXLIX (September, 1964), 25-26.

Morse, Grant D. "Are Teachers Associations Playing the Game Squarely?" American School Board Journal, CXLVII (October, 1963), 13-14.

Moskow, Michael H. "Teacher Organizations - An Analysis of the Issues," Teachers College Record, LXVI (February, 1965), 453-463.

NEA Executive Committee. "The Professional Way to Meet the Educational Crisis," NEA Journal, XXXVI (February, 1947), 79.

NEA Research Division. NEA Research Bulletin, XLIV (February, 1966), 22.

Newlon, Richard, and Betty J. Lee. "Denver Achieves Professional Negotiations," NEA Journal, LII (February, 1963), 15-16.

Oakes, R. C. "Should Teachers Strike - An Unanswered Question," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXIII (March, 1960), 339-344.

Paine, Louise. "Sanctions in Little Lake," NEA Journal LI (December, 1962), 54-55.

Parsons, Talcott. "Social Class and Class Conflict." American Economic Review. XXXIX (1949), 16-26.

Perry, Charles A., and Wesley A. Wildman. "A Survey of Collective Activity Among Public School Teachers." Education Administration Quarterly. II (Spring, 1966), 131-151.

"Report of State Survey on Board-Administrator-Teacher Relations," National School Board Association Bulletin, (April, 1964), 43-44.

Rice, A. H. "Collective Bargaining for Teachers," The Nation's Schools, LXVIII (July, 1961), 41-42.

Rich, John M. "Civil Disobedience and Teacher Strikes," Phi Delta Kappan, XLV (December, 1963), 151-154.

Rosen, Hjalmar and R. A. Hudson Rosen. "A Comparison of Parametric and Non-parametric Analysis of Opinion Data." The Journal of Applied Psychology XXXIX (1955), 401-404.

Scanlon, John. "Strikes, Sanctions and the Schools," Saturday Review,(October 19, 1963) 51-55.

"School Boards v. Teachers Organizations - Let's Start by Being Honest with Ourselves," American School Board Journal, CXLIX (October, 1964), 65-66.

Scheweissing, D. "Dangers on the Frontier," New York State Education, LII (October, 1964), 25-26.

Shoben, Edward J. "When Teachers Strike," Teachers College Record, LXV (November, 1963), 164-167.

Smith, Fred M. "The Teachers Union Versus the Professional Association," School and Society, XC (December, 1962), 39-40.

Steffensen, James P. "Appeal from an Impasse," Monthly Labor Review, LXXXVII (November, 1964), 1295-1296.

______. "Board, Staff Negotiations," School Life, XLVII (October, 1964), 6-8.

______. "Three Keys to Compromise," School Boards, VIII (February, 1965), 6-7.

Steet, Marion L. "Professional Associations - More than Unions," Teachers College Record, LXVI (December, 1964), 203-218.

Stinnett, T. M. "Alliance of AFT and AFL-CIO," Michigan Education Association Journal, XLII (April, 1965), 7-10.

______. "Prejudices and a Platform," Teacher College Record, LXIV (October, 1962), 40-49.

______. "Professional Negotiation, Collective Bargaining, Sanctions and Strikes," NASSP Bulletin, XLVIII (April, 1964), 93-104.

Tannenbaum, Robert, and Warren H. Schmidt. "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," Harvard Business Review, XXXVI (March-April, 1958), 96.

"Teacher Opinion Poll on Formal Group Action," NEA Journal, LV (September, 1965), 23-24.

Unruh, Adolph. "Negotiations and the Role of the Superintendent." Educational Forum, XXIX (January, 1965), 165-169.

Ware, Martha. "Professional Negotiations," NEA Journal, LI (November, 1962), 28-30.

West, A. M. "Local Associations Move Toward Professional Negotiation," NEA Journal, LIII (February, 1964), 26-28.

_______. "Professional Negotiation or Collective Bargaining," National Elementary Principal, XLII (February, 1963), 20-25.

Wildman, Wesley A. "Collective Action by Public School Teachers," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, XVIII (October, 1964), 3-19.

_______. "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (December, 1964), 152-158.

D. ARTICLE IN COLLECTION

Lynd, Robert S. "Power in American Society as Resource and Problem," Problems of Power in American Democracy, Arthur Kornhauser, editor. Detroit: Wayne State University Press,(1957), 7.

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Carlton, Patrick W. "The Attitudes of Certified Instructional Personnel in North Carolina toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiation and 'Sanctions.'" Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "The Hypothesis in Scientific Research." University of Oregon, February, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

Cheshier, Cavit C. "Sanctions by Professional Education Associations." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Peabody College, 1965.

Clark, Robert L. "The Roles and Positions of the NEA and AFT in Collective Negotiations." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1965.

Corwin, Ronald G. "The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools." Cooperative Research Project No. 1934, Washington: U. S. Office of Education, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

_______. "Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools." Cooperative Research Project No. 2637. Washington: U. S. Office of Education, 1966.

Fischer, John. "Board-Staff Relations - Issues and Alternatives." An address before the school board dinner of the Metropolitan School Study Council, November 28, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

Goldhammer, Keith, and others, "Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration." U. S. Office of Education Final Report No. 6-2423, August, 1967.

Hulon, Harold G. "Liberal-Conservative Attitudes of Public School Personnel In North Carolina." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of North Carolina, 1963.

Kerlinger, Fred N. "Manual for Education Scale I and Education Scale II. (n.d.) (Mimeographed.)

_______. "The First and Second order Factor Structure of Attitudes Toward Education." New York University, 1966 (Mimeographed.)

Moskow, Michael H. "Teachers and Unions: An Analysis of the Applicability of Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Pennsylvania, 1965.

Stinnett, T. M. "A Philosophy, A Program and A Passion." An address before Fifth National School for Teacher Salary Scheduling, Washington, September 7, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

Thorne, Irene. "A Study of Collective Negotiation Related to a Survey and Analysis of Teacher Group Collective Negotiation Contracts with School Boards." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1962.

Tidrick, Lawrence J. "The Social Attitudes of Social Science Teachers." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, New York University, 1936.

Williams, Neil Kerwin. "The Unions' Problems in a Changing Economy." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of North Carolina, 1964.

F. NEWSPAPERS

NEA Reporter, October 11, 1963.

NEA Reporter, January, 1964-December, 1964.

New York Times, January 16, 1964.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Items Selected Through Literature Search for Initial Pilot Project

1. Professions should be characterized by provision for a broad range of self-government for both the individual members and the occupational groups as a whole.

2. Professionals in teaching should not accept personal responsibility for judgments made and acts performed by them in their work.

3. Professionals in teaching should not try to establish standards for entrance to the profession.

4. The teaching profession should elevate its status by fixing standards high enough to gain recognition by the public.

5. Teachers' organizations should represent the membership in all matters affecting the profession.

6. Teachers' organizations should have a part in planning the curriculum.

7. Teachers' organizations should not have a voice in the selection of new teachers.

8. Teachers' organizations should have responsibility in the choice of new principals.

9. Teachers' organizations should not take part in the choosing of the superintendent.

10. Teachers' organizations should help in the planning of school buildings.

11. Teachers' organizations should have a voice in establishing school administrative policies.

12. Teachers' organizations should have a voice in determining salary schedules.

13. Teachers should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organizations and the school board cannot be reached.

14. Collective negotiations should omit the threat of withholding of services.

15. Teachers should be able to organize freely and to bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary.

16. Administrator dominated teacher groups should not be considered to be representative of the teachers in general.

17. Teachers' organizations at the local, state, and national levels should work together to persuade school boards to cooperate with them on matters of school welfare.

18. Teachers' organizations at local, state, and national levels should publicize unfair school board practices through the media, such as TV, radio, newspapers, and magazines.

19. Teachers' organizations at local, state, and national levels ought to officially discourage prospective applicants from applying for positions with school districts currently guilty of unethical practices.

20. Teachers seeking employment with offending school districts despite warnings by teachers' associations should be expelled from the organization.

21. Teachers seeking employment with offending school districts despite warnings by the teacher organization should be adjudged guilty of unethical practice.

22. "Sanctions" are not strong enough to really promote school board cooperation.

23. Procedures should be set up so that, in a case where the teacher organization and school board cannot agree, an appeal to the national teacher organization is possible.

24. Superintendents should not be members of teacher organizations.

25. School boards should resist by all possible means any attempt by teachers to encroach upon their legal rights and responsibilities.

26. I think the teacher is, in the final analysis, a civil servant employed by the local or state government.

27. I believe that collective bargaining by teachers is a conspiracy against the country.

28. I feel that strikes on the part of teachers are a necessary consequence of collective bargaining.

29. I think the only way for teachers to gain their proper status is for them to work for laws giving them legal authority to share in the determination of conditions of work, including salary.

30. I believe teachers' unions are made up almost entirely of malcontents and misfits.

31. The teacher should strike in order to enforce his demands.

32. I feel that the good teacher can always get the salary he needs without resorting to collective bargaining.

33. I believe that collective bargaining, alias professional negotiation, is beneath the dignity of the teacher.

34. The superintendent should, in reality, be a representative of the school board.

35. The superintendent should, in reality, be a representative of the teachers.

36. I think the superintendent can adequately fulfil the role of representative of both the school board and teachers.

37. I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.

38. I feel the teacher cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust.

39. I feel that professional negotiations are chipping away by inches at local control.

40. In the final analysis, I feel that the real issue in collective negotiations is that of who will control the schools, either the school board or the teachers.

41. I think the present teachers' associations are really controlled by the administration.

42. In the future, the representative of the teachers to the school board should be an elected teachers' association member.

43. I believe that teachers know more about what is good for the academic well-being of American youth than do the lay people of the school boards.

44. I think collective negotiation can help to unite the teaching profession into a cohesive body.

45. Collective negotiation should tend to move teacher groups more and more into local and state politics.

46. I think the drive for professional autonomy in the use of professional and legal sanctions is necessary to the well-being of teachers.

47. The board of education should recognize teaching as a profession and the local professional organization as the representative of its members.

48. Educational associations should use existing school channels to discuss matters of concern to the teachers and the school board.

49. School boards and teacher organizations should negotiate matters on which they do not at first agree.

50. The school board and teacher organization representatives should listen to one another's views and take these views into consideration when coming to a decision on matters affecting the schools.

51. The school board and teacher organization should set up a procedure agreeable to both groups to deal with an impasse.

52. Decisions leading to adoption of policy should be jointly determined by the association representatives and the school board.

53. I think it is a good idea to bring in a third party to settle disputes between the school board and teachers.

54. Compulsory arbitration should not be resorted to in teacher negotiation.

55. All matters of joint concern to the teachers and school board should be negotiable.

56. Cooperation in policy development between the school board and teachers tends to promote progress and effectiveness in school operations.

57. I think collective negotiation by teachers' organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship of the teachers.

58. I believe that state teachers' organizations are, on the whole, ineffective.

59. State teachers' organizations should practice organized lobbying.

60. I feel that the best way for teachers to gain their economic ends is to work for a change in the laws concerning control of the schools so that they may share the power involved.

61. I believe that more money is needed to finance the generally understaffed, underequipped schools of today.

62. It is my feeling that school people are attempting to build small empires by buying unnecessary equipment, hiring unneeded teachers, and generally working for self-aggrandizement.

63. I think collective negotiations can provide a vehicle whereby teachers gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their functions.

64. I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective negotiations are insincere power-seekers who do not have the best interests of education at heart.

65. I think it is inevitable that bad feelings arise between school board members and teacher representatives in the course of conducting the school's business.

66. The local teachers' organization should seek to regulate standards for hiring of new teachers.

67. Teachers' organizations should help set standards for the regulation of teacher performance.

68. I think most school boards are interested in doing anything necessary to promote the welfare of the educational program within the district.

69. I believe NEA employs professional agitators to go into local situations and stir up the teachers.

70. Teacher negotiators should be convinced that they have as legitimate a place at the bargaining table as the school board and the superintendent.

71. I feel that professional negotiation is nothing more thank a specialized form of collective bargaining suited to the needs of the teachers.

72. Teachers should avoid, at all cost, identification with the labor movement.

73. Teachers should refuse to accept a position that has been created through unprofessional activity, or pending controversy over professional policy or the application of unjust personnel practices or procedures.

74. I think teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances.

75. I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of teacher responsibility for self-discipline and for insisting upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education.

76. I believe sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.

77. I believe that censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special study reports, newspapers, or other mass media is a legitimate technique for teacher use.

78. I feel that the traditional position that civil employees may not strike is the only defensible position for a sensible school district to take.

79. I believe that certain classes of public employees, including the teachers, should be allowed to strike, since their services are not necessary to the public welfare.

80. I believe that any teacher strike is completely unprofessional.

81. There is probably no real difference between the strike and the sanction.

82. Teachers should not be required to join any particular professional teachers' organization as a prerequisite to employment.

83. I think that the state legislature is free to provide by statute that public employees may enforce their right to collective bargaining by arbitration or strike.

84. I believe that for a professional person to continue to serve under conditions which make it impossible to render adequate service is unethical.

85. School boards should refuse to discuss educational matters with representatives of teachers' organizations or unions, since this is not their concern.

86. I believe that the child does not come first in any system that underpays, undervalues, and overworks its teachers.

87. I think teachers are tired of being "paid in prestige" instead of money.

88. School boards, subject to the requirements of applicable law, should refrain from compromise agreements based on negotiation or collective bargaining and should not resort to mediation or arbitration.

89. All attempts to infringe upon school board authority in the selection and adoption of textbooks and other curricular materials should be resisted.

90. Teachers should have a voice in matters of what constitutes adequate compensation and proper working conditions.

91. I feel that school boards should establish policy which includes staff, administration, as well as the school board in the discussion of total budgetary needs.

92. I think that the prestige and authority of school boards is gradually declining.

93. I feel that school board members should not sit idly by and allow the children to be sold down the river because of the non-professional pressure tactics of the so-called professionals in the field of public education.

94. I think that the hiring of non-certified substitutes to fill empty classrooms in time of teacher strikes is completely justified by circumstances.

95. I believe that by saying that they cannot delegate authority to others, school boards are saying they cannot do the very thing they've been doing for years.

96. I feel that failure to find means to involve teachers in the determination of policies affecting them will impair the schools and adversely affect the education of children.

97. I believe that when the school board denies the reasonable requests of the teachers, the teachers have a right to present the facts to the public and to their professional associates in other school districts.

98. I think that if school boards fail to make reasonable welfare provisions for all staff members and fail to provide machinery through which grievances can be given appropriate consideration, the state legislature is likely to establish appeal procedures.

99. I think collective negotiation can bring greater order and system to education.

100. If the teacher doesn't like a salary, he should refuse the contract and look elsewhere.

101. A strike or a sanction should be the very last resort and represents the failure of the community.

102. The right of participation where the individual is affected should be recognized as a basic tenet of democratic life.

103. I think that professional negotiation will spread to every metropolis and village.

104. I think school boards lose some of their authority when they engage in negotiations.

APPENDIX B

Items Selected for Inclusion in Intermediate Pilot Project

1. Teachers' organizations should not have a voice in the seclection of new teachers.

2. Teachers' organizations should have responsibility in the choice of new principals.

3. Teachers should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organizations and the school board cannot be reached.

4. Collective negotiations should omit the threat of withholding of services.

5. Teachers should be able to organize freely and to bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary.

6. Teachers' organizations at local, state, and national levels should publicize unfair school board practices through the media, such as TV, radio, newspapers, and magazines.

7. I believe that collective bargaining by teachers is a conspiracy against the country.

8. I feel that strikes on the part of teachers are a necessary consequence of collective bargaining.

9. I believe teachers' unions are made up almost entirely of malcontents and misfits.

10. The teacher should strike in order to enforce his demands.

11. I feel that the good teacher can always get the salary he needs without resorting to collective bargaining.

12. I believe that collective bargaining, alias professional negotiation, is beneath the dignity of the teacher.

13. I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.

14. I feel that the teacher cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust.

15. I feel that professional negotiations is chipping away by inches at local control.

16. I think collective negotiation can help to unite the teaching profession into a cohesive body.

17. I think collective negotiation by teachers' organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship of the teachers.

18. I think collective negotiations can provide a vehicle whereby teachers gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their functions.

19. I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective negotiation are insincere power-seekers who do not have the best interests of education at heart.

20. The local teachers' organization should seek to regulate standards for hiring of new teachers.

21. I think teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances.

22. I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of teacher responsibility for self-discipline and for insisting upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education.

23. I believe sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.

24. I believe that censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special study reports, newspapers, or other mass media is a legitimate technique for teacher use.

25. I feel that the traditional position that civil employees may not strike is the only defensible position for a sensible school district to take.

26. I believe that certain classes of public employees, including the teachers, should be allowed to strike, since their services are not necessary to the public welfare.

27. I believe that any teacher strike is completely unprofessional.

28. All attempts to infringe upon school board authority in the selection and adoption of textbooks and other curricular materials should be resisted.

29. I believe that when the school board denies the reasonable requests of the teachers, the teachers have a right to present the facts to the public and to their professional associates in other school districts.

30. I think collective negotiation can bring greater order and system to education.

APPENDIX C

Probability Sampling Formula[1]

$$n = \frac{x^2 N\pi(1-\pi)}{d^2(N-1) + x^2\pi(1-\pi)}$$

where

n = required sample size

x^2 = table value of chi square for one (1) degree of freedom and desired confidence level (2.706)

N = population size

π = population proportion which it is desired to estimate (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size).

d = degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion.

---

[1] "Small Sample Techniques," NEA Research Bulletin, XXXVIII (December, 1960), p. 99.

APPENDIX D (1)

R Matrix for CA Scales I, II, and III. (Item Intercorrelations)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
1	1.00																												
2	.74	1.00																											
3	.32	.35	1.00																										
4	.04	.06	.12	1.00																									
5	.19	.27	.39	.16	1.00																								
6	.21	.21	.30	.07	.34	1.00																							
7	.06	.10	.04	-.26	.01	-.01	1.00																						
8	.03	-.01	.07	.38	.09	.02	-.25	1.00																					
9	.04	.07	.16	-.04	.12	.06	.09	.01	1.00																				
10	.14	.14	.37	.17	.23	.13	-.09	.23	.25	1.00																			
11	.06	.06	.16	-.02	.14	.12	.15	-.02	.30	.20	1.00																		
12	.07	.06	.22	.04	.28	.15	.15	.03	.35	.29	.53	1.00																	
13	.15	.16	.37	.08	.24	.20	.00	.11	.30	.57	.34	.40	1.00																
14	.17	.19	.43	.12	.24	.22	-.06	.14	.27	.58	.31	.35	.65	1.00															
15	.10	.09	.19	.03	.23	.16	.10	.07	.29	.18	.41	.47	.33	.34	1.00														
16	.17	.18	.28	.08	.33	.23	.06	.06	.13	.14	.21	.28	.25	.22	.30	1.00													
17	.07	.10	.17	-.04	.20	.16	.16	-.04	.27	.08	.41	.44	.23	.17	.51	.25	1.00												
18	.16	.18	.27	.10	.35	.24	.08	.04	.16	.15	.21	.30	.23	.18	.31	.62	.30	1.00											
19	.10	.09	.14	-.04	.22	.17	.08	-.05	.32	.18	.37	.39	.24	.21	.41	.25	.49	.29	1.00										
20	.30	.28	.20	.01	.14	.19	-.02	.05	.06	.12	.10	.12	.12	.11	.13	.15	.15	.19	.13	1.00									
21	.16	.18	.33	.09	.25	.23	.10	.04	.12	.13	.13	.16	.20	.21	.15	.23	.13	.25	.17	.24	1.00								
22	.14	.14	.30	.08	.22	.23	.10	.03	.17	.18	.21	.21	.29	.25	.27	.31	.18	.31	.20	.24	.55	1.00							
23	.14	.17	.32	.11	.25	.24	.09	.05	.17	.20	.18	.19	.29	.27	.25	.33	.17	.34	.19	.26	.55	.80	1.00						
24	.13	.13	.17	.03	.15	.28	.10	.00	.07	.06	.12	.08	.11	.13	.06	.15	.09	.21	.09	.16	.30	.29	.31	1.00					
25	.12	.12	.24	.06	.20	.16	.03	.14	.27	.34	.29	.33	.37	.39	.31	.18	.24	.16	.22	.13	.18	.24	.22	.10	1.00				
26	.06	.04	.14	.10	.09	.09	-.03	.13	.05	.14	.04	.11	.15	.14	.12	.15	.06	.13	.08	.11	.07	.12	.13	.00	.16	1.00			
27	.09	.12	.24	.06	.20	.17	.08	.09	.29	.27	.30	.33	.34	.31	.31	.19	.26	.16	.26	.10	.28	.31	.34	.15	.34	.11	1.00		
28	.04	.05	.11	-.02	.07	.08	.13	-.04	.15	-.02	.18	.22	.03	-.03	.16	.07	.22	.11	.25	.07	.21	.12	.10	.17	.16	.04	.19	1.00	
29	.14	.15	.23	.05	.17	.26	.18	.02	.06	.07	.13	.10	.08	.13	.03	.18	.09	.25	.08	.19	.29	.21	.22	.34	.09	.00	.14	.17	1.00
30	.16	.18	.28	.11	.34	.22	.09	.06	.10	.16	.19	.21	.20	.19	.25	.50	.24	.58	.26	.17	.24	.32	.34	.21	.18	.10	.22	.14	.34

APPENDIX D (2)

Unrotated Factor Loadings of CA I, II and III - F Matrix

CA I Scale

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
11	.52	.44	-.16	-.06	.04	-.06	.07
12	.60	.45	-.08	-.05	-.07	-.05	.05
15	.57	.39	-.11	-.02	-.16	-.08	-.19
17	.51	.38	-.33	-.10	-.18	-.17	-.08
19	.51	.34	-.26	-.08	-.15	-.16	-.06

CA II Scale

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
21	.52	-.34	-.13	.27	.33	-.09	-.10
22	.61	-.26	-.12	.38	.31	.07	-.35
23	.62	-.30	-.08	.38	.29	.08	-.33
27	.54	.17	.03	.11	.24	.15	.01

CA III Scale

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
3	.58	-.22	.22	-.18	.07	.12	.12
10	.49	.17	.56	-.06	.14	.17	.14
13	.62	.24	.38	-.05	.17	.26	.06
14	.60	.19	.46	-.08	.18	.26	.12
25	.51	.24	.20	-.02	.15	-.12	.03

APPENDIX D (3)

Inter-correlations Among Scale Items

CA I - CA II

		CA II			
		21	22	23	27
CA I	11	.13	.21	.18	.30
	12	.16	.22	.19	.33
	15	.15	.27	.25	.31
	17	.13	.18	.17	.26
	19	.17	.20	.19	.26

CA I - CA III

		CA III				
		3	10	13	14	25
CA I	11	.16	.20	.34	.31	.29
	12	.22	.29	.40	.35	.33
	15	.19	.18	.33	.34	.31
	17	.17	.08	.23	.17	.24
	19	.14	.18	.24	.21	.22

CA II - CA III

		CA III				
		3	10	13	14	25
CA II	21	.33	.13	.20	.21	.18
	22	.30	.18	.29	.25	.24
	23	.32	.20	.29	.27	.22
	27	.24	.27	.34	.31	.34

APPENDIX E

Box 1051
Chapel Hill, N.C.
February, 1966

Dear Educator:

As a doctoral student in the School of Education of the University of North Carolina, I am conducting a dissertation study designed to determine the philosophical positions of North Carolina educators on matters concerning collective action by teachers in their dealings with local school boards and other educational agencies. The efforts of United States teachers to "professionalize" their calling to an extent not possible prior to this time makes it desirable that such information be generally available to educators. It is hoped that you, as a dedicated educator, will want to support this effort to add to current knowledge in this area. The total time for filling out the materials is under 15 minutes.

The study is being done under the direction of Dr. John Otts, Acting Dean of the School of Education at UNC. Dr. Otts feels that the study can make a worthwhile contribution to knowledge in this area.

Mr. J. E. Miller, Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction, has cooperated fully in developing the study, and indicates his full support of this venture. His endorsement and that of Dr. Otts are to be found on the first page of the instrument.

In order that participants in the study feel comfortable, data and biographical materials will be held in strictest confidence. Information included in the study will be in statistical form only, and no names will be used. Thus, complete anonymity is assured for all concerned.

Your cooperation in this educational effort will be most appreciated. A stamped, return-addressed envelope is provided for your convenience. It is hoped you will reply soon.

Cordially yours,

Patrick W. Carlton
Doctoral Student

Box 1051
Chapel Hill, N.C.
March, 1966

Dear Educator:

About a month ago a request for your participation in a current doctoral study was sent to you. This study is being sponsored by the School of Education of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, with full support of the State Department of Public Instruction.

It is hoped that you received the materials and have looked them over. You will note that the study is designed to add to the information available on the thinking of North Carolina educators with regard to teacher collective action. The time required for your participation is under 15 minutes.

As was pointed out in the previous letter, complete anonymity is assured you as a participant in the study. This is designed to prevent possible embarrassment to you.

It will be much appreciated if you will take a few minutes and complete the instruments sent to you. In case you have misplaced the original materials, a new set is enclosed, along with another stamped, return-addressed envelope. Please return these at your earliest convenience. Thanks for your help.

Cordially yours,

Patrick W. Carlton
Doctoral Student.

PHILOSOPHICAL POSITIONS OF NORTH CAROLINA EDUCATORS ON MATTERS CONCERNING TEACHER-BOARD RELATIONSHIPS.

ENDORSEMENTS:

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The Department of Public Instruction is interested in the doctoral study of Patrick W. Carlton, and feels that it can make an important contribution to the field of Education. It is hoped that educators will lend their maximum support to this research effort.

Cordially yours,

J.E. Miller

J. E. Miller
Assistant Superintendent
State Department of
Public Instruction

*** *** ***

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This is to certify that the research being undertaken by Patrick W. Carlton is well known to several members of the School of Education staff of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and we believe that this is an important piece of research. I can assure you that Mr. Carlton will treat the information received in the most professional manner and will compile his findings in a way that will prove helpful to the profession in North Carolina and in the nation. The School of Education appreciates your cooperation in this matter. We sincerely believe that you will perform a good service for education by participating in this important study.

Cordially yours,

John Otts

John Otts.
Acting Dean

*** *** ****

I. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Please place the number of the correct response in the box to the right of each item. Using the list below, choose the three-digit code number for your county and write it in the box. (Last item.) Use ink. Please do not sign this sheet. The numbering system employed is designed solely to help the computation center analyze the data, and not for identification purposes.

*****

Example of correct marking technique.
Color of hair: 1. brown 2. black 3. red ____3____

***** *****

Present position: 1. teacher 2. principal 3. other ________
Sex: 1. male 2. female ________
Marital status: 1. married (Living with spouse)
2. unmarried (single, divorced, separated)
3. widowed ________

***** *****

Years lived in North Carolina: 1. 0-10 2. over 10 ________
Education: (Highest level) 1. Bachelors Degree
2. Masters Degree
3. Sixth year ________

Type of School Unit in Which employed: 1. City 2. county ________

***** *****

Size of town you live in: 1. live in county 2. up to 10,000
3. 10,000-50,000 4. over 50,000 ________
Years of Public School Experience: 1. 0-5 2. 6-15 3. over 15 ________
Level at which employed: 1. Elementary 2. Junior High
3. High School ________

***** *****

Highest Certification Level: 1. Initial Certification (Class A or below, or Principals) 2. Graduate Certificate or Advanced Principals ________
County in which you live; (Choose the 3 digit code number from the list of counties below and place it on the lines to the right. ___ ___ ___

***** ***** *****

County Names With Code Number Designations

Code No.	County name	Code no.	County name	Code no.	County name
010	Alamance	350	Franklin	690	Pamlico
020	Alexander	360	Gaston	700	Pasquotank
030	Allegheny	370	Gates	710	Pender
040	Anson	380	Graham	720	Perquimmans
050	Ashe	390	Granville	730	Person
060	Avery	400	Greene	740	Pitt
070	Beaufort	410	Guilford	750	Polk
080	Bertie	420	Halifax	760	Randolph
090	Bladen	430	Harnett	770	Richmond
100	Brunswick	440	Haywood	780	Robeson
110	Buncombe	450	Henderson	790	Rockingham
120	Burke	460	Hertford	800	Rowan
130	Cabarrus	470	Hoke	810	Rutherford
140	Caldwell	480	Hyde	820	Sampson
150	Camden	490	Iredell	830	Scotland
160	Carteret	500	Jackson	840	Stanley
170	Caswell	510	Johnston	850	Stokes
180	Catawba	520	Jones	860	Surry
190	Chatham	530	Lee	870	Swain
200	Cherokee	540	Lenoir	880	Trannsylvania
210	Chowan	550	Lincoln	890	Tyrrell
220	Clay	560	Macon	900	Union
230	Cleveland	570	Madison	910	Vance
240	Columbus	580	Martin	920	Wake
250	Craven	590	McDowell	930	Warren
260	Cumberland	600	Mecklenberg	940	Washington
270	Currituck	610	Mitchell	950	Watauga
280	Dare	620	Montgomery	960	Wayne
290	Davidson	630	Moore	970	Wilkes
300	Davie	640	Nash	980	Wilson
310	Duplin	650	New Hanover	990	Yadkin
320	Durham	660	Northampton	995	Yancey
330	Edgecombe	670	Onslow		
340	Forsyth	680	Orange		

II. Definitions of terms used in Scale Two.

Collective Negotiations- The "family" name for various forms of group action used by teachers in attaining their goals. Under this term are included collective bargaining and Professional Negotiation.

Collective Bargaining- A form of collective negotiation, generally associated with the organized labor movement. Some teacher groups practice collective bargaining.

Professional Negotiation- A form of collective negotiations developed by the National Education Association as an "alternative" to collective bargaining.

"Sanctions"- A term applied to coercive acts of various kinds, varying in intensity from verbal warning to withholding of services. Sanctions of all types are used to gain concessions from the employer.

Strike- A severe form of sanction involving concerted work stoppage by employees. The strike is normally associated with organized labor, although it has been used fairly frequently by teachers.

***** ***** *****

III. SCALE NUMBER ONE:

Record the number corresponding to your answer to each statement on the line provided in the right margin beside each statement. Use ink. The choices of answer and their numbers follow:

***** ***** *****

5. agree
6. agree strongly
7. agree very strongly

3. disagree
2. disagree strongly
1. disagree very strongly

***** ***** *****

Example of correct marking procedure:
I believed that taxes should be lowered. 7

***** ***** *****

The goals of education should be dictated by children's interests and needs, as well as by the larger demands of society. __________

No subject is more important than the personalities of pupils.

Schools today are neglecting the three R's.

The pupil-teacher relationship is the relationship between a child who needs direction, guidance, and control and a teacher who is an expert supplying direction, guidance, and control.

***** ***** *****

Teachers, like university professors, should have academic freedom- freedom to teach what they think is right and best.

The backbone of the school curriculum is subject matter; activities are useful mainly to facilitate the learning of subject matter.

Teachers should encourage pupils to study and criticize our own and other economic systems and practices.

The traditional moral standards of our culture should not just be accepted; they should be examined and tested in solving the present problems of students.

***** ***** *****

Learning is experimental; the child should be taught to test alternatives before accepting them.

The curriculum consists of subject matter to be learned and skills to be acquired.

The true view of education is so arranging learning that the child gradually builds up a storehouse of knowledge that he can use in the future.

One of the big difficulties of modern schools is that discipline is often sacrificed to the interests of the children.

***** ***** *****

The curriculum should contain an orderly arrangement of subjects that represent the best of our cultural heritage.

Discipline should be governed by long-range interests and well-established standards.

Education and educational institutions must be sources of new social ideas; education must be a social program undergoing continual reconstruction.

Right from the very first grade, teachers must teach the child at his own level and not at the level of the grade he is in.

***** ***** *****

Children should be allowed more freedom than they usually get in the execution of learning activities.

Children need and should have more superivision and discipline than they usually get.

Learning is essentially a process of increasing one's store of information about the various fields of knowledge.

In a democracy, teachers should help students understand not only the meaning of democracy but also the meaning of the ideologies of other political systems.

***** ***** *****

IV. SCALE NUMBER TWO.

Please respond to the following statements by placing the number corresponding to your choice in the box at the right of the item. The numbering varies from question to question. Mark undecided if you don't understand the item.

***** ***** *****

Example of correct marking technique:

I believe that taxes should be lowered. 5

(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(SA)	(A)	(U)	(D)	(SD)

The choices will be abbreviated throughout the instrument.

***** ***** *****

Teachers organizations should participate in the selection of new teachers.
5 4 3 2 1
SA A U D SD

Teachers organizations should have responsibility in the choice of new principals.
5 4 3 2 1
SA A U D SD

Teachers should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organizations and the school board cannot be reached
5 4 3 2 1
SA A U D SD

***** *****

Collective negotiation should omit the threat of withholding of services.
1 2 3 4 5
SA A U D SD

Teachers should be able to organize freely and to bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary.
5 4 3 2 1
SA A U D SD

Teachers organizations at local, state and national levels should publicize unfair school board practices through the media, such as TV, radio, newspapers, and magazines.
5 4 3 2 1
SA A U D SD

*****

I believe that collective negotiation by teachers is a conspiracy against the country.
1 2 3 4 5
SA A U D SD

I feel that strikes on the part of teachers are an undesirable consequence of collective bargaining.
1 2 3 4 5
SA A U D SD

I believe militant teachers groups are made up almost entirely of malcontents and misfits.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
***** *****		*****
Teachers should not strike in order to enforce their demands.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
I feel that the good teacher can always get the salary he needs without resorting to collective negotiation.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
I believe that collective bargaining, alias professional negotiation, is beneath the dignity of the teacher.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
***** *****		*****
I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
I feel that the teacher cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
I feel that collective negotiations is chipping away by inches at local control and should be resisted.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
***** *****		*****
I think collective negotiations can help to unite the teaching profession into a cohesive body.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
I think collective negotiations by teachers organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship by the teachers.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
I think collective negotiations can provide a vehicle whereby teachers gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their functions.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
***** *****		*****
I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective negotiations are insincere power seekers who do not have the best interests of education at heart.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
The local teachers organization should seek to regulate standards for hiring of new teachers.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
I think teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
***** *****		*****
I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of teacher responsibility for self-discipline and for insistance upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
I believe sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
I believe that censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special study reports, newspapers, or other mass media is a legitimate technique for teachers to use.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	
***** *****		*****
I feel that the traditional position that teachers, as public employees, may not strike is the only defensible position for a sensible school district to take.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
I don't feel that the services of teachers are so necessary to the public welfare as to necessitate the forfeiture of their right to strike.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
I believe that any teacher sanction or other corrcive measure is completely unprofessional.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
***** *****		*****
All attempts to infringe upon school board authority in the selection and adoption of textbooks and other curricular materials should be resisted.	1 2 3 4 5 SA A U D SD	______
I believe that when the school board denies the reasonable requests of the teachers, the teachers have a right to present the facts to the public and to their professional associates in other school districts.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______
I think collective negotiation can bring greater order and system to education.	5 4 3 2 1 SA A U D SD	______

APPENDIX F

Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings and Item-Total Correlations of all Items of Education Scale I*

Items	I	II	III	h^2	A	B	C	h^2	r_{it}
(A)									
1	24	31	26	22	44	01	17	22	44
2	10	37	15	17	39	-14	07	17	48
5	16	44	-12	24	42	-13	-21	24	57
7	13	41	-20	23	36	-14	-28	23	49
8	30	40	-17	28	45	01	-27	28	53
9	27	46	-03	28	51	-05	-13	28	59
15	32	48	-07	33	55	-03	-19	33	60
16	14	34	10	14	37	-09	02	14	47
17	11	59	23	41	58	-26	12	41	63
20	21	34	-20	20	35	-03	-28	20	42
(B)									
3	10	-46	-34	34	-38	35	-27	34	47
4	23	-33	16	19	-10	38	19	19	50
6	42	-32	-17	30	-05	52	-16	30	56
10	33	-39	14	28	-09	50	17	28	55
11	45	-37	09	35	-02	58	10	35	61
12	28	-54	-22	41	-31	54	-16	41	62
13	29	-42	25	32	-11	48	28	32	54
14	30	-29	21	22	-01	41	22	22	46
18	25	-54	-22	41	-33	52	-16	41	61
19	44	-48	11	43	-10	64	13	43	68

Underlining indicates a significant loading.

* All decimal points ommitted. Any loading above .30 was considered significant. All item-total r's are significant at .01.
This table reproduced from: F. N. Kerlinger, "Manual for Education Scale I and Education Scale II," New York University (mimeographed), p.14.